arXiv:1703.09648v1 [math.HO] 25 Mar 2017

Gane Samb LO

A Course on Elementary Probability Theory

Statistics and Probability African Society (SPAS) Books Series.
Saint-Louis, Calgary, Alberta. 2016.

DOI : http://dx.doi.org/10.16929/sbs/2016.0003

ISBN 978-2-9559183-3-3

SPAS TEXTBOOKS SERIES

GENERAL EDITOR of SPAS EDITIONS

Prof Gane Samb LO
gane-samb.lo@ugb.edu.sn, gslo@ugb.edu.ng
Gaston Berger University (UGB), Saint-Louis, SENEGAL.
African University of Sciences and Technology, AUST, Abuja, Nigeria.

ASSOCIATED EDITORS

KEHINDE DAHUD SHANGODOYIN
shangodoyink@mopipi.ub.bw
UNIVERSITY Of BOTSWANA

Blaise SOME
some@univ-ouaga.bf
Chairman of LANIBIO, UFR/SEA
Ouaga I Pr Joseph Ki-Zerbo University.

ADVISORS

Ahmadou Bamba SOW
ahmadou-bamba.sow@ugb.edu.sn
Gaston Berger University, Senegal.

Tchilabalo Abozou KPANZOU
kpanzout@yahoo.fr
Kara University, Togo.

List of published books

SPAS Textbooks Series.

Weak Convergence (IA). Sequences of random vectors.
Par Gane Samb LO, Modou Ngom and Tchilabalo Abozou KPANZOU.
(2016) Doi : 10.16929/sbs/2016.0001. ISBN : 978-2-9559183-1-9 (English).

A Course on Elementary Probability Theory.
Gane Samb LO (March 2017)
Doi : 10.16929/sbs/2016.0003. ISBN : 978-2-9559183-3-3 (English).

For the latest updates, visit our official website :

www.statpas.net/spaseds/

Library of Congress Cataloging-in-Publication Data

Gane Samb LO, 1958-

A Course on Elementary Probability Theory.

SPAS Books Series, 2016.

Copyright ©Statistics and Probability African Society (SPAS).

DOI : 10.16929/sbs/2016.0003

ISBN 978-2-9559183-3-3

Author : Gane Samb LO

Emails:
gane-samb.lo@ugb.edu.sn, ganesamblo@ganesamblo.net, gslo@aust.edu.ng

Url's:
www.ganesamblo@ganesamblo.net
www.statpas.net/cva.php?email.ganesamblo@yahoo.com.

Affiliations.
Main affiliation : University Gaston Berger, UGB, SENEGAL.
African University of Sciences and Technology, AUST, ABuja, Nigeria.
Affiliated as a researcher to : LSTA, Pierre et Marie Curie University, Paris VI, France.

Teaches or has taught at the graduate level in the following universities:
Saint-Louis, Senegal (UGB)
Banjul, Gambia (TUG)
Bamako, Mali (USTTB)
Ouagadougou - Burkina Faso (UJK)
African Institute of Mathematical Sciences, Mbour, SENEGAL, AIMS.
Franceville, Gabon

Acknowledgment of Funding.

The author acknowledges continuous support of the World Bank Excellence Center in Mathematics, Computer Sciences and Intelligence Technology, CEA-MITIC. His research projects in 2014, 2015 and 2016 are funded by the University of Gaston Berger in different forms and by CEA-MITIC.

A Course on Elementary Probability Theory

Abstract. (**English**) This book introduces to the theory of probabilities from the beginning. Assuming that the reader possesses the normal mathematical level acquired at the end of the secondary school, we aim to equip him with a solid basis in probability theory. The theory is preceded by a general chapter on counting methods. Then, the theory of probabilities is presented in a discrete framework. Two objectives are sought. The first is to give the reader the ability to solve a large number of problems related to probability theory, including application problems in a variety of disciplines. The second was to prepare the reader before he approached the manual on the mathematical foundations of probability theory. In this book, the reader will concentrate more on mathematical concepts, while in the present text, experimental frameworks are mostly found. If both objectives are met, the reader will have already acquired a definitive experience in problem-solving ability with the tools of probability theory and at the same time he is ready to move on to a theoretical course on probability theory based on the theory of measurement and integration. The book ends with a chapter that allows the reader to begin an intermediate course in mathematical statistics.

(**Français**) Cet ouvrage introduit à la théorie des probabilités depuis le début. En supposant que le lecteur possède le niveau mathématique normal acquis à la fin du lycée, nous ambitionnons de le doter d'une base solide en théorie des probabilités. L'exposé de la théorie est précédé d'un chapitre général sur les méthodes de comptage. Ensuite, la théorie des probabilités est présentée dans un cadre discret. Deux objectifs sont recherchés. Le premier est de donner au lecteur la capacité à résoudre un grand nombre de problèmes liés à la théorie des probabilités, y compris les problèmes d'application dans une variété de disciplines. Le second était de préparer le lecteur avant qu'il n'aborde l'ouvrage sur les fondements mathématiques de la théorie des probabilités. Dans ce dernier ouvrage, le lecteur se concentrera davantage sur des concepts mathématiques tandis que dans le présent texte, il se trouvent surtout des cadres expérimentaux. Si les deux objectifs sont atteints, le lecteur aura déjà acquis une expérience définitive en capacité de résolution de problèmes de la vie réelle avec les outils de la théorie des probabilités et en mme temps, il est prt à passer à un cours théorique sur les probabilités basées sur la théorie de la mesure et l'intégration. Le livre se termine par par un chapitre qui permet au lecteur de commencer un cours intermédiaire en statistiques mathématiques.

Keywords. Combinatorics; Discrete counting; Elementary Probability; Equi-probability; Events and operation on events; Independence of events; Conditional probabilities; Bayes' rules; Random variables; Discrete and continuous random variables; Probability laws; Probability density functions; Cumulative distribution functions; Independence of random variables; Usual probability laws and their parameters; introduction to statistical mathematics.

AMS 2010 Classification Subjects : 60GXX; 62GXX.

Contents

General Preface 3

Preface of the first edition 2016 5

Introduction 9
1. The point of view of Probability Theory 9
2. The point of view of Statistics 10
3. Comparison between the two approaches 11
4. Brief presentation of the book 12

Chapter 1. Elements of Combinatorics 15
1. General Counting principle 15
2. Arrangements and permutations 16
3. Number of Injections, Number of Applications 18
4. Permutations 19
5. Permutations with repetition 20
6. Stirling's Formula 30

Chapter 2. Introduction to Probability Measures 31
1. An introductory example 31
2. Discrete Probability Measures 33
3. equi-probability 38

Chapter 3. Conditional Probability and Independence 41
1. The notion of conditional probability 41
2. Bayes Formula 44
3. Independence 50

Chapter 4. Random Variables 55
1. Introduction 55
2. Probability Distributions of Random Variables 58
3. Probability laws of Usual Random Variables 60
4. Independence of random variables 70

Chapter 5. Real-valued Random Variable Parameters 73
1. Mean and Mathematical Expectation 73

2. Definition and examples 74
3. General Properties of the Mathematical Expectation 75
4. Usual Parameters of Real-valued Random Variables 82
5. Parameters of Usual Probability law 94
6. Importance of the mean and the standard deviation 100

Chapter 6. Random couples 105
1. Strict and Extended Values Set for a Discrete Random Variable 105
2. Joint Probability Law and Marginal Probability Laws 107
3. Independence 110
4. An introduction to Conditional Probability and Expectation 127

Chapter 7. Continuous Random Variables 135
1. Cumulative Distribution Functions of a Real-valued random Variable (*rrv*) 135
2. General properties of *cdf*'s 139
3. Real Cumulative Distribution Functions on $\mathbb{R}$ 141
4. Absolutely Continuous Distribution Functions 144
5. The origins of the Gaussian law in the earlier Works of *de* Moivre and Laplace (1732 - 1801) 151
6. Numerical Probabilities 160

Chapter 8. Appendix : Elements of Calculus 165
1. Review on limits in $\overline{\mathbb{R}}$. What should not be ignored on limits. 165
2. Convex functions 177
3. Monotone Convergence and Dominated Converges of series 182
4. Proof of Stirling's Formula 189

Bibliography 197

Dedication.

To our beloved and late sister Khady Kane LO
27/07/1953 - 7/11/1988

FIGURE 1. The ever smiling young lady

General Preface

This textbook part of a series whose ambition is to cover broad part of Probability Theory and Statistics. These textbooks are intended to help learners and readers, both of of all levels, to train themselves.

As well, they may constitute helpful documents for professors and teachers for both courses and exercises. For more ambitious people, they are only starting points towards more advanced and personalized books. So, these texts are kindly put at the disposal of professors and learners.

Our textbooks are classified into categories.

A series of introductory books for beginners. Books of this series are usually accessible to student of first year in universities. They do not require advanced mathematics. Books on elementary probability theory and descriptive statistics are to be put in that category. Books of that kind are usually introductions to more advanced and mathematical versions of the same theory. The first prepare the applications of the second.

A series of books oriented to applications. Students or researchers in very related disciplines such as Health studies, Hydrology, Finance, Economics, etc. may be in need of Probability Theory or Statistics. They are not interested by these disciplines by themselves. Rather, the need to apply their findings as tools to solve their specific problems. So adapted books on Probability Theory and Statistics may be composed to on the applications of such fields. A perfect example concerns the need of mathematical statistics for economists who do not necessarily have a good background in Measure Theory.

A series of specialized books on Probability theory and Statistics of high level. This series begin with a book on Measure Theory, its counterpart of probability theory, and an introductory book on topology. On that basis, we will have, as much as possible, a coherent

presentation of branches of Probability theory and Statistics. We will try to have a self-contained, as much as possible, so that anything we need will be in the series.

Finally, **research monographs** close this architecture. The architecture should be so large and deep that the readers of monographs booklets will find all needed theories and inputs in it.

We conclude by saying that, with only an undergraduate level, the reader will open the door of anything in Probability theory and statistics with **Measure Theory and integration**. Once this course validated, eventually combined with two solid courses on topology and functional analysis, he will have all the means to get specialized in any branch in these disciplines.

Our collaborators and former students are invited to make live this trend and to develop it so that the center of Saint-Louis becomes or continues to be a re-known mathematical school, especially in Probability Theory and Statistics.

Preface of the first edition 2016

The current series of Probability Theory and Statistics are based on two introductory books for beginners : A Course of Elementary probability Theory and A course on Descriptive Statistics.

All the more or less advanced probability courses are preceded by this one. We strongly recommend to not skip it. It has the tremendous advantage to make feel the reader the essence of probability theory by using extensively random experiences. The mathematical concepts come only after a complete description of a random experience.

This book introduces to the theory of probabilities from the beginning. Assuming that the reader possesses the normal mathematical level acquired at the end of the secondary school, we aim to equip him with a solid basis in probability theory. The theory is preceded by a general chapter on counting methods. Then, the theory of probabilities is presented in a discrete framework.

Two objectives are sought. The first is to give the reader the ability to solve a large number of problems related to probability theory, including application problems in a variety of disciplines. The second was to prepare the reader before he approached the textbook on the mathematical foundations of probability theory. In this book, the reader will concentrate more on mathematical concepts, while in the present text, experimental frameworks are mostly found. If both objectives are met, the reader will have already acquired a definitive experience in problem-solving ability with the tools of probability theory and at the same time he is ready to move on to a theoretical course on probability theory based on the theory of measurement and integration.

The book ends with a chapter that allows the reader to begin an intermediate course in mathematical statistics.
I wish you a pleasant reading and hope receiving your feedback.

To my late and beloved sister Khady Kane Lo(1953-).

Saint-Louis, Calgary, Abuja, Bamako, Ouagadougou, 2017.

Preliminary Remarks and Notations.

WARNINGS

(1)

(2)

Introduction

There exists a tremendous number of random phenomena in nature, real life and experimental sciences.

Almost everything is random in nature : whether, occurrences of rain and their durations, number of double stars in a region of the sky, lifetimes of plants, of humans, and of animals, life span of a radioactive atom, phenotypes of offspring of plants or any biological beings, etc.

The general theory states that each phenomena has a structural part (that is deterministic) and an random part (called the error or the deviation).

Random also appears is conceptual experiments : tossing a coin once or 100 times, throwing three dice, arranging a deck of cards, matching two decks, playing roulettes, etc.

Every day human life is subject to random : waiting times for buses, traffic, number of calls on a telephone, number of busy lines in a communication network, sex of a newborn, etc.

The reader is referred to Feller [**6**] for a more diverse and rich set of examples.

The quantitative study of random phenomena is the objective of Probability Theory and Statistics Theory. Let us give two simple examples to briefly describe each of these two disciplines.

1. The point of view of Probability Theory

In Probability Theory, one assigns a chance of realization to a random event before its realization, taking into account the available information.

Example : A *good coin*, that is a homogenous and well balanced, is tossed. Knowing that the coin cannot stand on its rim, there is a 50% chances of having a Tail.

We base our conclusion on the lack of any reason to favor one of the possible outcomes : head or tail. So we convene that these outcomes are equally probable and then get 50% chances for the occurring for each of them.

2. The point of view of Statistics

Let us start with an example. Suppose that we have a coin and we do not know any thing of the material structure of the coin. In particular, we doubt that the coin is homogenous.

We decide to toss it repeatedly and to progressively monitor the occurring frequency of the head. We denote by N_n the number of heads obtained after n tossings and define the frequency of the heads by

$$F_n = \frac{N_n}{n}.$$

It is conceivable to say that the stability of F_n in the neighborhood of some value $p \in]0,1[$ is an important information about the structure of the coin.

In particular, if we observe that the frequency F_n does not deviate from $p = 50\%$ more than $\varepsilon = 0.001$ whenever n is greater than 100, that is

$$|F_n - 1/2| \leq 10^{-3}.$$

for $n \geq 100$, we will be keen to say that the probability of occurrence of the head is $p = 50\%$ and, by this, we accept that that the coin is fair.

Based on the data (also called the statistics), we **estimated** the probability of having a head at $p = 50\%$ and accepted the pre-conceived idea (hypothesis) that the coin is *good* in the sense of homogeneity.

The reasoning we made and the method we applied are perfect illustrations of Statistical Methodology : estimation and model or hypothesis validation from data.

In conclusion, Statistics Theory enables the use of the data (also called statistics or observations), to estimate the law of a random phenomenon and to use that law to predict the future of the same phenomenon (*inference*) or to predict any other phenomenon that seems identical to it (*extrapolation*).

3. Comparison between the two approaches

(1) The discipline of Statistics Theory and that of Probability Theory are two ways of treating the same random problems.

(2) The first is based primarily on the data to draw conclusions .

(3) The second is based on theoretical, and mathematical considerations to establish theoretical formulas.

(4) Nevertheless, the Statistics discipline may be seen as the culmination of Probability Theory.

4. Brief presentation of the book

This book is an introduction to Elementary Probability Theory. It is the result of many years of teaching the discipline in Universities and High schools, mainly in Gaston Berger Campus of Saint-Louis, SENEGAL.

It is intended to those who have never done it before. It focuses on the essential points of the theory. It is particularly adapted for undergraduate students in the first year of high schools.

The basic idea of this book consists of introducing Probability Theory, and the notions of events and random variables in discrete probability spaces. In such spaces, we discover as much as possible at this level, the fundamental properties and tools of the theory.

So, we do not need at this stage the elaborated notion of σ-algebras or fields. This useful and brilliant method has already been used, for instance, in Billingsley [**7**] for deep and advanced probability problems.

The book will finish by a bridge chapter towards a medium course of Mathematical Statistics. In this chapter, we use an anology method to express the former results in a general shape, that will be the first chapter of the afore mentioned course.

The reader will have the opportunity to master the tools he will be using in this course, with the course on the mathematical foundation of Probability Theory he will find in Lo [**4**], which is an element of our Probability and Statistics series. But, as explained in the prefaces, the reader will have to get prepared by a course of measure theory.

In this computer dominated world, we are lucky to have very powerful and free softwares like R and Scilab, to cite only the most celebrated. We seized this tremendous opportunity to use numerical examples using R software throughout the text.

The remainder of the book is organized as following.

Chapter 1 is a quick but sufficient introduction to combinatorial analysis. The student interested in furthering knowledge in this subject can

refer to the course on general algebra.

Chapter 2 is devoted to an introduction to probability measures in discrete spaces. The notion of equi-probability is also dealt with, there.

Conditional probability and independence of random events are addressed with in Chapter 3.

Chapter 4 introduces random variables, and presents a review of the usual probability laws.

Chapter 5 is devoted to the computations of the parameters of the usual laws. Mastering the results of this chapter and those in Chapter 4 is in fact of great importance for higher level courses.

Distribution functions of random variables are studied in Chapter 7, which introduces non-discrete random variables.

CHAPTER 1

Elements of Combinatorics

Here, we are concerned with counting cardinalities of subsets of a reference set Ω, by following specific rules. We begin by a general counting principle.

The cardinality of a set E is its number of elements, denoted by $Card(E)$ or $\#(E)$. For an infinite set E, we have

$$Card(E) = \#(E) = +\infty.$$

1. General Counting principle

Let us consider the following example : A student has two (2) skirts and four (4) pants in his closet. He decides to pick at random a skirt and a pant to dress. In how many ways can he dress by choosing a skirt and a pant? Surely, he has 2 choices for choosing a skirt and for each of these choices, he has four possibilities to pick a pant. In total, he has

$$2 \times 4$$

ways to dress.

We applied the following general counting principle.

Proposition 2.1. Suppose that the set Ω of size n can be partitioned into n_1 subsets Ω_i, $i = 1, ..., n_1$ of same size; and that each of these subsets Ω_i can be split into n_2 subsets Ω_{ij}, j = 1, . . ., n_2, $i = 1, ..., n_1$, of same size, and that each of the Ω_{ij} can be divided into n_3 subsets Ω_{ijh}, $h = 1, ..., n_3$, $j = 1, ..., n_2$, $i = 1, ..., n_1$ of same size also. Suppose that we may proceed like that up an order k with n_k subsets with common size a.

Then the cardinality of Ω is given by

$$n = n_1 \times n_2 \times \times ... \times n_k \times a$$

Proof. Denote by B_h the cardinality of a subset generated at step h, for $h = 0, ..., k$. A step h, we have n_h subsets partitioned into n_{h+1} subsets of same size. Then we have

$$B_h = n_{h+1} \times B_{h+1} \text{ for all } 0 \leq h \leq k+1.$$

with $B_0 = n$, $B_{k+1} = a$. Now, the proof is achieved by induction in the following way

$$\begin{aligned} n &= B_0 = n_1 \times B_1 \\ &= n_1 \times n_2 \times n_3 B_3 \\ &... \\ &= n_1 \times n_2 \times n_3 B_3 \times .... \times n_k \times B_(k+1), \end{aligned}$$

with $B_(k+1) = a$.

Although this principle is simple, it is a fundamental tool in combinatorics : divide and count.

But it is not always applied in a so simple form. Indeed, partitioning is the most important skill to develop in order to apply the principle successfully.

This is what we will be doing in all this chapter.

2. Arrangements and permutations

Let E be a set of n elements with $n \geq 1$.

Definition 2.1. A p-tuple of E is an ordered subset of E with p distinct elements of E. A p-tuple is called a p-permutation or p-arrangement of elements of E and the number of p-permutations of elements of E is denoted as A_n^p (we read p before n). It as also denoted by $(n)_p$.

We have the result.

Theorem 2.1. For all $1 \leq p \leq n$, we have

$$A_n^p = n(n-1)(n-2).....(n-p+1).$$

Proof. Set $E = \{x_1, ..., x_n\}$. Let Ω be the class of all ordered subsets of p elements of E. We are going to apply the counting principle to Ω.

It is clear that Ω may be divided into $n = n_1$ subsets F_i, where each F_i is the class of ordered subsets of Ω with first elements x_i. Since the first element is fixed to x_i, the cardinality of F_i is the number ordered subsets of $E\backslash x_i$, so that the classes F_i have a common cardinality which is the number of $(p-1)$-permutations from a set of $(n-1)$ elements. We have proved that

$$A_n^p = n \times A_{n-1}^{p-1}, \tag{2.1}$$

for any $1 \leq p \leq n$. We get by induction

$$A_n^p = n \times (n-1) \times A_{n-2}^{p-2}$$

and after h repetitions of (2.1), we arrive at

$$A_n^p = n \times (n-1) \times (n-2) \times ... \times (n-h) \times A_{n-h}^{p-h}.$$

For $h = p-2$, we have

$$A_n^p = n \times (n-1) \times (n-2) \times ... \times (n-p+2) \times A_{n-p+1}^1.$$

And, clearly, $A_{n-p+1}^1 = n-p+1$ since A_{n-p+1}^1 is the number of singletons form a set of $(n-p+1)$ elements.

Remark. Needless to say, we have $A_n^p = 0$ for $p \leq n+1$.

Here are some remarkable values of A_n^p. For any positive integer $n \geq 1$, we have

(i) $A_n^0 = A_n^n = 1$.
(ii) $A_n^1 = n$.

From an algebraic point of view, the numbers A_n^p also count the number of injections.

3. Number of Injections, Number of Applications

We begin to remind the following algebraic definitions :

A function from a set E to a set F is a correspondence from E to F such that each element of E has at most one image in F.

An application from a set E to a set F is a correspondence from E to F such that each element of E has exactly one image in F.

An injection from a set E to a set F is an application from E to F such that each any two distinct elements of E have distinct images in F.

A surjection from a set E to a set F is an application from E to F such that each element of F is the image of at least one element of E.

A bijection from a set E onto a set F is an application from E to F such that that each element of F is the image of one and only element of E.

If there is an injection (respectively a bijection) from E to F, then we have the inequality :$Card(E) \leq Card(F)$ (respectively, the equality $Card(E) = Card(F)$).

The number of p-arrangements from n elements ($p \leq n$) is the number of injections from a set of p elements to a set of n elements.

The reason is the following. Let $E = \{y_1, ..., y_p\}$ and $F = \{x_1, x_2, ..., x_n\}$ be sets with $Card(E) = p$ and $Card(F) = n$ with $p \leq n$. Forming an injection f from E on F is equivalent to choosing a p-tuple $(x_{i_1}...x_{i_p})$ in F and to set the following correspondance $f(y_h) = x_{i_h}$, $h = 1, ..., p$. So, we may find as many injections from E to F as p-permutations of elements of from F.

Thus, A_n^p is also the number of injections from a set of p elements on a set of n elements.

The number of applications from a set of p elements to a set of n elements is n^p.

Indeed, let $E = \{y_1, ..., y_p\}$ and $F = \{x_1, x_2, ..., x_n\}$ be sets with $Card(E) = p$ and $Card(F) = n$ with no relation between p and n. Forming an application f from E on F is equivalent to choosing, for any $x \in E$, one arbitrary element of F and to assign it to x as its image. For the first element x_1 of E, we have n choices, n choices also for the second x_2, n choices also for the third x_3, and so forth. In total, we have choices to form an application from E to F.

Example on votes casting in Elections. The p members of some population are called to mandatory cast a vote for one of n candidates at random. The number of possible outcomes is the number of injections from a set of p elements to a set of n elements : n^p.

4. Permutations

Definition 2.2. A permutation or an ordering of the elements of E is any ordering of all its elements. If n is the cardinality of E, the number of permutations of the element of E is called : *n factorial*, and denoted $n!$ (that is n followed with an exclamation point).

Before we give the properties of *n factorial*, we point out that a permutation of n objects is a n-permutation of n elements.

Theorem 2.2. For any $n \geq 1$, we have

(i) $n! = n(n-1)(n-2).....2 \times 1$.

(ii) $n! = n(n-1)!$.

Proof. By reminding that a permutation of n objects is a n-permutation of n elements, we may see that Point (i) is obtained for $p = n$ in the Formula of Theorem 2.1. Point (ii) obviously derives from from (i) by induction.

Exercise 2.1. What is the number of bijections between two sets of common cardinalily $n \geq 1$?

Exercise 2.2. Check that for any pour $1 \leq p \leq n$.

$$A_n^p = n!/(n-p)!$$

,

5. Permutations with repetition

Let $\mathcal{E}$ be collection of n distinct objects. Suppose that E is partitioned into k sub-collections $\mathcal{E}_j$ of respective sizes $n_1, \ . \ . \ .n_k$ the following properties apply :

(i) Two elements of a same sub-collection are indistinguishable between them.

(ii) Two elements from two different sub-collections are distinguishable one from the other.

What is the number of permutations of E? Let us give an example.

Suppose we have $n = 20$ balls of the same form (not distinguishable by the form, not at sight nor by touch), with $n_1 = 6$ of them in red color, $n_2 = 9$ of blue color and $n_3 = 5$ of green color. And we can distinguish them only by their colors. In this context, two balls of the same color are the same for us, from our sight. An ordering of these n balls in which we cannot distinguish the balls of a same color is called a permutation with repetition or a visible *permutation*.

Suppose that have we realized a permutation of these n balls. Permuting for example only red balls between them does not change the appearance of the global permutation. Physically, it has changed but not visibly meaning from our sight. Such a permutation may be described as *visible*, or *permutation with repetition*.

In fact, any of $n!$ real permutations represents all the *visible* repetitions where the 6 red balls are permuted between them, the 9 blue balls are permuted between them and the 5 green balls are permuted between them. By the counting principle, a real permutation represents exactly

$$9! \times 6! \times 5!$$

permutations with repetition. Hence, the number of permutations with repetition of these 20 balls is

$$\frac{20!}{9! \times 6! \times 5!}$$

Now, we are going to do the same reasoning in the general case.

As we said before, we have two types of permutations here :

(a) The real or physical permutations, where the n are supposed to be distinguishable.

(b) The permutations with repetition in which we cannot distinguish between the elements of a same sub-collection.

Theorem 2.3. The number of permutations with repetition of a collection $\mathcal{E}$ of n objects partitioned into k sub-collections $\mathcal{E}_i$ of size n_i, $i = 1, ..., k$, such such only elements from different sub-collections are distinguishable between them, is given by

$$B(n_1, n_2, ..., n_k) = \frac{n!}{n_1!n_2!.....n_k!}.$$

Terminology. The numbers of permutations with repetition are also called *multinomial coefficients*, in reference Formula (5.3).

Proof. Let $B(n_1, n_2, ..., n_k)$ be number of permutations with repetition. Consider a fixed real permutation. This real permutation corresponds exactly to all permutations with repetition obtained by permuting the n_1 objects of $\mathcal{E}_1$ between them, the n_2 objects of $\mathcal{E}_2$ between them, . . ., and the n_k objects of $\mathcal{E}_k$ between them. And we obtain $n_1!n_2!.....n_k!$ permutations with repetition corresponding to the same real permutation. Since this is true for any real permutation which generates

$$n_1! \times n_2! \times ... \times n_k!$$

visible permutations, we get that

$$(n_1!n_2!.....n_k!) \times B(n_1, n_2, ..., n_k) = n!.$$

This gives the result in the theorem.

5.1. Combinations. Let us define the numbers of combinations as follows.

Definition 2.3. Let E be a set of n elements. A combination of p elements of E is a subset if E of size p.

In other words, any subset F of E is a p-combination of elements of E if and only if $CardF = p$.

It is important to remark that we can not have combinations of more that n elements in a set of n elements.

We have :

Theorem 2.4. The number of combinations of p elements from n elements is given by

$$\left(\begin{array}{c} n \\ p \end{array} \right) = \frac{n!}{p!(n-p)!}.$$

Proof. Denote by

$$\left(\begin{array}{c} n \\ p \end{array} \right)$$

the number of combinations of p elements from n elements.

The collection of p-permutations is exactly obtained by taking all the orderings of the elements of the combinations of p elements from E. Each combination gives $p!$ p-permutations of E. Hence, the cardinality of the collection of p-permutations is exactly $p!$ times that of the class of p-combinations of E, that is

$$p! \left(\begin{array}{c} n \\ p \end{array} \right) = A_n^p,$$

By using Exercise 2.1 above, we have

$$\left(\begin{array}{c} n \\ p \end{array} \right) = \frac{A_n^p}{p!} = \frac{n!}{p!(n-p)!.}.$$

We also have this definition :

Definition 2.4. The numbers $\begin{pmatrix} n \\ p \end{pmatrix}$, are also called binomial coefficients because of Formula (5.2) below.

5.2. Urn Model. The urn model plays a very important role in discrete Probability Theory and Statistics, especially in sampling theory. The simplest example of urn model is the one where we have a number of balls, distinguishable or not, of different colors.

We are going to apply the concepts seen above in the context of urns.

Suppose that we want to draw r balls at random from an urn containing n balls that are distinguishable by touch (where touch means hand touch).

We have two ways of drawing.

(i) *Drawing without replacement.* This means that we draw a first ball and we keep it out of the urn. Now, there are $(n-1)$ balls in the urn. We draw a second and we have $(n-2)$ balls left in the urn. We repeat this procedure until we have the p balls. Of course, p should be less or equal to n.

(ii) *Drawing with replacement.* This means that we draw a ball and take note of its identity or its characteristics (that are studied) and put it back in the urn. Before each drawing, we have exactly n balls in the urn. A ball can be drawn several times.

It is clear that the drawing model **(i)** is exactly equivalent to the following one :

(i-bis) We draw p balls at the same time, simultaneously, at once.

Now, we are going to see how the p-permutations and the p-combinations occur here, by a series of questions and answers.

Questions. Suppose that an urn contains n distinguishable balls. We draw p balls. In how many ways can the drawing occur? Or what is the number of possible outcomes in term of subsets formed by the p

drawn balls?

Solution 1. If we draw the p balls **without replacement** and **we take into account the order**, the number of possible outcomes is the number of p-permutations.

Solution 2. If we draw the p balls **without replacement** and **we do not take the order into account or there is no possible ordering**, the number outcomes is the number of p-combinations from n.

Solution 3. If we draw the p balls **with replacement**, the number of outcomes is n^p, the number of applications.

Needless to say, the ordering is always assumed if we proceed by a drawing with replacement.

Please, keep in mind these three situations that are the basic keys in Combinatorics.

Now, let us explain the solutions before we continue.

Proof of Solution 1. Here, we draw the p balls once by once. We have n choices for the first ball. Once this ball is out, we have $(n-1)$ remaining balls in the urn and we have $(n-1)$ choices for the second ball. Thus, we have

$$n \times (n-1)$$

possible outcomes to draw two ordered balls. For three balls, $p = 3$, we have the number

$$n \times (n-1) \times (n-2).$$

Remark that for $p = 1, 2, 3$, the number of possible outcomes is

$$n \times (n-1) \times (n-2) \times .... \times (n-p+1) = A_n^p.$$

You will have any difficulty to get this by induction.

Proof of Solution 2. Here, there is no ordering. So we have to divide the number of ordered outcomes A_n^p by $p!$ to get the result.

Proof of Solution 3. At each step of the p drawing, we have n choices. At the end, we get n^p ways to draw p elements.

We are going to devote a special subsection to the numbers of combinations or binomial coefficients.

5.3. Binomial Coefficients. Here, we come back to the number of combinations that we call Binomial Coefficients here. First, let us state their main properties.

Main Properties.

Proposition 2.1. We have

(1) $\begin{pmatrix} n \\ 0 \end{pmatrix} = 1$ for all $n \geq 0$.

(2) $\begin{pmatrix} n \\ 1 \end{pmatrix} = n$ for all $n \geq 1$.

(3 $\begin{pmatrix} n \\ p \end{pmatrix} = \begin{pmatrix} n \\ n-p \end{pmatrix}$, pour $0 \leq p \leq n$.

(4) $\begin{pmatrix} n-1 \\ p-1 \end{pmatrix} + \begin{pmatrix} n-1 \\ p \end{pmatrix} = \begin{pmatrix} n \\ p \end{pmatrix}$, for all $1 \leq p \leq n$.

Proof. Here, we only prove Point (4). The other points are left to the reader as exercises.

$$\begin{pmatrix} n-1 \\ p-1 \end{pmatrix} + \begin{pmatrix} n-1 \\ p \end{pmatrix} = \left\{ \frac{(n-1)!}{(p-1)!(n-p)!} \right\} + \left\{ \frac{(n-1)!}{p!(n-p-1)!} \right\}$$

$$= p \left\{ \frac{(n-1)!}{p!(n-p)!} \right\} + (n-p) \left\{ \frac{(n-1)!}{p!(n-p)!} \right\}$$

$$= \left\{ \frac{(n-1)!}{p!(n-p)!} \right\} \{n+n-p\} = \frac{n(n-1)!}{p!(n-p)!}$$

$$= \frac{n!}{p!(n-p)!} = \begin{pmatrix} n \\ p \end{pmatrix}. \ QED.$$

Pascal's Triangle. We are going to reverse the previous way by giving some of these properties as characteristics of the binomial coefficients.

We have

Proposition 2.3. The formulas

(i) $\left(\begin{array}{c} n \\ 0 \end{array}\right) = \left(\begin{array}{c} n \\ n \end{array}\right) = 1$ for all $n \geq 0$.

(ii) $\left(\begin{array}{c} n-1 \\ p-1 \end{array}\right) + \left(\begin{array}{c} n-1 \\ p \end{array}\right) = \left(\begin{array}{c} n \\ p \end{array}\right)$, for all $1 \leq p \leq n$.

entirely characterize the binomial coefficients

$$\left(\begin{array}{c} n \\ p \end{array}\right), \quad 1 \leq p \leq n.$$

Proof. We give the proof by using Pascal's triangle. Point (ii) gives the following clog rule (*règle du sabot in French*)

n p	p-1	p
n-1	$\left(\begin{array}{c} n-1 \\ p-1 \end{array}\right)$	$\left(\begin{array}{c} n-1 \\ p \end{array}\right)$
n		$\left(\begin{array}{c} n \\ p \end{array}\right) = \left(\begin{array}{c} n-1 \\ p-1 \end{array}\right) + \left(\begin{array}{c} n-1 \\ p \end{array}\right)$

or more simply

u	v
	$u+v$

With is rule, we may construct the Pascal's triangle of the numbers $\left(\begin{array}{c} n \\ p \end{array}\right)$.

n/p	0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8
0	**1**								
1	**1**=u	**1**=v							
2	**1**	$\overset{u+v}{2}$	**1**						
3	**1**	*3*	*3*	**1**					
4	**1**	*4*=u	*6*=v	*4*	**1**				
5	**1**	*5*	$\overset{u+v}{10}$	*10*	*5*	**1**			
6	**1**						**1**		
7	**1**							**1**	
8	**1**								**1**

The reader is asked to continue to fill this triangle himself. Remark that filling the triangle only requires the first column ($n = 0$), the diagonale ($p = n$) and the clog rule. So points (i) and (ii) are enough to determine all the binomial coefficients. This leads to the following conclusion.

Proposition 2.4. Any array of integers $\beta(p, n)$, $0 \leq p \leq n$ such that

(i) $\beta(n, n)$=$\beta(0, n)$= 1, for all tout n ≥ 0,

(ii) $\beta(p-1, n-1) + \beta(p, n-1) = \beta(p, n)$, for $1 \leq p \leq n$.

is exactly the array of of binomial coefficients, that is

$$\beta(p, n) = \left(\begin{array}{c} n \\ p \end{array} \right), \quad 0 \leq p \leq n.$$

We are going to visit the Newton's formula.

The Newton's Formula.

Let us apply the result just above to the power n of a sum of two scalars in a commutative ring ($\mathbb{R}$ for example).

THEOREM 1. *For any $(a, b) \in \mathbb{R}^2$, for any $n \geq 1$, we have*

$$(a+b)^n = \sum_{p=0}^{n} \left(\begin{array}{c} n \\ p \end{array} \right) a^p \ b^{n-p}. \tag{5.1}$$

Proof. Since $\mathbb{R}$ is a commutative ring, we know that $(a + b)^n$ is a polynom in a and b and it is written as a linear combination of terms $a^p \times b^{n-p}$, p = 0,...,n. We have the formula

$$(a+b)^n = \sum_{p=0}^{n} \beta(p, \ n) \ a^p \ b^{n-p}. \tag{5.2}$$

It will be enough to show that the array $\beta(p, \ n)$ is actually that of the binomial coefficients. To begin, we write

$$(a+b)^n = (a+b) \times (a+b) \times ... \times (a+b).$$

From there, we see that $\beta(p,n)$ is the number of choices of a or b in each factor $(a+b)$ such that a is chosen p times and b is chosen $(n-p)$ times. Thus $\beta(n,\ n) = 1$ since a^n is obtained in the unique case where a is chosen in each factor $(a+b)$. Likely $\beta(0,\ n) = 1$, since this corresponds to the monomial b^n, that is the unique case where b is chosen in each case. So, Point (i) is proved for the array $\beta(\cdot,\cdot)$. Next, we have

$$(a+b)^n = (a+b)(a+b)^{n-1} = (a+b) \times \sum_{p=0}^{n-1} \beta(p,\ n-1) a^p\ b^{n-p-1}$$

$$= (a+b)(\ .\ .\ . + \beta(p-1,\ n-1)\ a^{p-1}b^{n-p}$$

$$... + \beta(p,\ n-1)a^p\ b^{n-p-1} + ...$$

This means that, when developing $(a+b)(a+b)^{n-1}$, the term $a^p \times b^{n-p}$ can only come out

(1) either from the product of b by $a^p \times b^{n-p-1}$ of the binomial $(a+b)^{n-1}$,

(2) or from the product of a by $a^{p-1} \times b^{n-p}$ of the binomial $(a+b)^{n-1}$.

Then it comes out that for $\leq p \leq n$, we get

$$\beta(p-1,\ n-1) + \beta(p,\ n-1) = \beta(p,\ n).$$

We conclude that the array $\beta(p,n)$ fulfills Points (i) and (ii) above. Then, this array is that of the binomial coefficients. QED.

Remark. The name of binomial coefficients comes from this Newton's formula.

Multiple Newton's Formula.

We are going to generalize the Newton's Formula from dimension $k = 2$ to an arbitrary dimension $k \geq 2$. Then binomial coefficients will be replaced by the numbers of permutations with repetition.

Let $k \geq 2$ and let be given real numbers a_1,a_2, ..., and a_k and let $n \geq 1$ be a positive number. Consider

$$\Gamma_n = \{(n_1, ..., n_k), n_1 \leq 0, ..., n_k \leq 0, n_1 + ... + n_k = n\}.$$

We have

(5.3)
$$(a_1 + ... + a_k)^n = \sum_{(n_1,...,n_k)\in\Gamma_n} \frac{n}{(n_1! \times n_2! \times ... \times n_k!)} a_1^{n_1} \times a_2^{n_1} \times ... \times a_k^{n_k},$$

that we may write in a more compact manner in

$$(\sum_{i=1}^{k} a_i)^n = \sum_{(n_1,...,n_k)\in\Gamma_n} \frac{n}{\prod_{i=1}^{k} n_i!} \prod_{i=1}^{k} a_i^{n_i}. \tag{5.4}$$

We will see how this formula is important for the multinomial law, which in turn is so important in Statistics.

Proof. Let us give a simple proof of it.

To develop $(\sum_{i=1}^{k} a_i)^n$, we have to multiply $(\sum_{i=1}^{k} a_i)$ by itself n times. By the distributivity of the sum with respect to the product, the result will be a sum of products

$$z_1 \times z_2 \times ... \times z_n$$

where each z_i is one of the a_1, a_2, ..., a_k. Par commutativity, each of these products is of the form

$$a_1^{n_1} \times a_2^{n_1} \times ... \times a_k^{n_k}, \tag{5.5}$$

where $(n_1, ..., n_k) \in \Gamma_n$. And for a fixed $(n_1, ..., n_k) \in \Gamma_n$, the product (5.5) is the same as all products

$$z_1 \times z_2 \times ... \times z_n,$$

in which we have n_1 of the z_i identical to a_1, n_2 identical to a_2, ..., and n_k identical to à a_k. These products correspond to the permutations with repetition of n elements such that n_1 are identical, n_2 are identical, ..., and n_k are identical. Then, each product (5.5) occurs

$$\frac{n}{(n_1! \times n_2! \times ... \times n_k!)}$$

times in the expansion. This puts an end to the proof.

6. Stirling's Formula

6.1. Presentation of Stirling's Formula (1730).

The number $n!$ grows and becomes huge very quickly. In many situations, it may be handy to have an asymptotic equivalent formula.

This formula is the Sterling's one and it is given as follows :

$$n! = (2^{\pi}\ n)^{\frac{1}{2}}\ (\frac{n}{e})^{n}\ \exp(\theta_n),$$

with, for any $\eta > 0$, for n large enough,

$$|\theta_n| \leq \frac{1+\eta}{(12n)}.$$

This implies, in particular, that

$$n! \sim (2^{\pi}\ n)^{\frac{1}{2}}\ (\frac{n}{e})^{n},$$

as $n\ \to\ \infty$.

One can find several proofs (See Feller [**6**], page 52, for example). In this textbook, we provide a proof in the lines of the one in [**14**], pp. 167, that is based on Wallis integrals. This proof is exposed the Appendix Chapter 8, Section 4.

We think that a student in first year of University will be interested by an application of the course on Riemann integration.

CHAPTER 2

Introduction to Probability Measures

1. An introductory example

Assume that we have a perfect die whose six faces are numbered from 1 to 6. We want to toss it twice. Before we toss it, we know that the outcome will be a couple (i, j), where i is the number that will appear first and j the second.

We always keep in mind that, in probability theory, we will be trying to give answers about events that have not occurred yet. In the present example, the possible outcomes form the set

$$\Omega = \{1, 2, ..., 6\} \times \{1, 2, ..., 6\} = \{(1, 1), (1, 2), ..., (6, 6)\}.$$

Ω is called the *sample* space of the experience or the *probability space*. Here, the size of the set Ω is finite and is exactly 36. Parts or subsets of Ω are called events. For example,

(1) $\{(3, 4)\}$ is the event : *Face 3 comes out in the first tossing and Face 4 in the second*,

(2) $\mathrm{A} = \{(1, 1), (1, 2), (1, 3), (1, 4), (1, 5), (1, 6)\}$ is the event : *1 comes out in the first tossing*.

Any element of Ω, as a singleton, is an elementary event. For instance $\{(1, 1)\}$ is the elementary event : *Face 1 appears in both tossings*.

In this example, we are going to use the perfectness of the die, and the regularity of the geometry of the die, to the conviction that

(1) All the elementary events have equal chances of occurring, that is one chance out of 36.

and then

(2) Each event A of Ω has a number of chances of occurring equal to its cardinality.

We remind that an event A occurs if and only if the occurring elementary event in A.

Denote by $\mathbb{P}(A)$ the fraction of the number of chances of occurring of A and the total number of chances $n = 36$, i.e.,

$$\mathbb{P}(A) = \frac{CardA}{36}.$$

Here, we say that $\mathbb{P}(A)$ is the probability that the event A occur after the tossings.

We may easily check that

(1) $\mathbb{P}(\Omega) = 1, and 0 \leq \mathbb{P}(A) \leq 1$ for all $A \subseteq \Omega$.

(2) For all A, B, parts of Ω such that $A \cap B = \emptyset$, we have

$$\mathbb{P}(A \cup B) = \mathbb{P}(A) + \mathbb{P}(B).$$

Notation : if A and B are disjoint, we adopt the following convention and write :

$$A \cup B = A + B.$$

As well, if $(A_n)_{n\geq 0}$ is a sequence of pairwise disjoint events, we write

$$\bigcup_{n\geq 0} A_n = \sum_{n\geq 0} A_n.$$

We summarize this by saying : **We may the symbol + (plus) in place of the symbol $\cup$ (union), when the sets of mutually mutually disjoint, that is pairwise disjoint.**

The so-defined application $\mathbb{P}$ is called a probability measure because of (1) and (2) above.

If the space Ω is infinite, (2) is written as follows.

(2) For any sequence of events $(A_n)_{n\geq 0}$ pairwise disjoint, we have

$$\mathbb{P}(\sum_{n\geq 0} A_n) = \sum_{n\geq 0} \mathbb{P}(A_n)$$

Terminology.

(1) The events A and B are said to be mutually exclusive if $A \cup B = \emptyset$. On other words, the events A and B cannot occur simultaneously.

(2) If we have $\mathbb{P}(A) = 0$, we say that the event A is impossible, or that A is a null-set with respect to $\mathbb{P}$.

(3) If we have $\mathbb{P}(A) = 1$, we say that the event A a sure event with respect to $\mathbb{P}$, or that the event A holds the probability measure $\mathbb{P}$.

Nota-Bene. For any event A, the number $\mathbb{P}(A)$ is a probability (that A occur). But the application, that is the mapping, $\mathbb{P}$ is called a probability measure.

Now we are ready to present the notion of probability measures. But we begin with discrete ones.

2. Discrete Probability Measures

Let Ω be a with finite cardinality or with infinite countable cardinality. Let $\mathcal{P}(\Omega)$ be the class of parts of Ω.

Definition 1. An application $\mathbb{P}$, defined from $\mathcal{P}(\Omega)$ to $[0, 1]$ is called a *probability measure* on Ω if and only if :

(1) $\mathbb{P}(\Omega) = 1$.

(2) For all sequences of pairwise disjoint events $(A_i, i \in \mathbb{N})$ of Ω, we have

$$\mathbb{P}\left(\sum_i A_i\right) = \sum_i \mathbb{P}(A_i).$$

We say that the triplet $(\Omega, \mathcal{P}(\Omega), \mathbb{P})$ is a probability space.

Terminology. Point (2) means that $\mathbb{P}$ is additive on $\mathcal{P}(\Omega)$. It will be referred to it under the name of *additivity*.

2.1. Properties of a probability measure. .

Let $(\Omega, \mathcal{P}(\Omega), \mathbb{P})$ a probability space. We have the following properties. Each of them will be proved just after its statement.

(A) $\mathbb{P}(\emptyset) = 0$.

Proof : . By additivity, we have

$$\mathbb{P}(\emptyset) = \mathbb{P}(\emptyset + \emptyset) = \mathbb{P}(\emptyset) + \mathbb{P}(\emptyset) = 2\mathbb{P}(\emptyset).$$

Then, we get $\mathbb{P}(\emptyset) = 0$.

(B) If $(A, B) \in \mathcal{P}(\Omega)^2$ and if $A \subseteq B$, then $\mathbb{P}(A) \leq \mathbb{P}(B)$.

Proof. Recall the definition of the difference of subsets :

$$B \setminus A = x \in \Omega, x \in B \text{ as } x \notin A = B \cap A^c.$$

Since $A \subset B$, we have

$$B = (B \setminus A) + A.$$

Then, by additivity,

$$\mathbb{P}(B) = \mathbb{P}((B \setminus A) + A) = \mathbb{P}(B \setminus A) + \mathbb{P}(A).$$

It comes that

$$\mathbb{P}(B) - \mathbb{P}(A) = \mathbb{P}(B \setminus A) \geq 0.$$

(C) If $(A, B) \in \mathcal{P}(\Omega)^2$ and if $A \subseteq$ B, through $\mathbb{P}(B \setminus A) = \mathbb{P}(B) - \mathbb{P}(A)$.

Proof. This is already proved through (B).

(D) (**Continuity Property of a Probability measure**) Let $(A_n)_{n \geq 0}$ be a non decreasing sequence of subsets of Ω with limit A, that is :

(1) For all $n \geq 0$, $\mathrm{A}_n \subseteq A_{n+1}$

and

(2) $\cup_{n\geq 0} \mathrm{A}_n = A^{\cdot}$
Then $\mathbb{P}(\mathrm{A}_n) \uparrow \mathbb{P}(A)$ as $n \uparrow \infty$.

Proof : Since the sequence $(A_j)_{j\geq 0}$ is non-decreasing, we have

$$A_k = A_0 + (A_1 \setminus A_0) + (A_2 \setminus A_1) + ... + (A_k \setminus A_{k-1}),$$

for all $k \geq 1$. And then, finally,

$$A = A_0 + (A_1 \setminus A_0) + (A_2 \setminus A_1) + ... + (A_k \setminus A_{k-1}) + ...$$

Denote $B_0 = A_0$ et $B_k = A_k \setminus A_{k-1}$, for $k \geq 1$. By using the additivity of $\mathbb{P}$, we get

$$\mathbb{P}(A) = \sum_{j\geq 0} \mathbb{P}(B_k) = \lim_{k\to\infty} \sum_{0\leq j\leq k} \mathbb{P}(B_k).$$

But

$$\sum_{0\leq j\leq k} \mathbb{P}(B_k) = \mathbb{P}(A_0) + \sum_{1\leq j\leq k} \mathbb{P}\left(A_k \setminus A_{k-1}\right)$$

$$= \mathbb{P}(A_0) + \sum_{1\leq j\leq k} \mathbb{P}(A_k) - \mathbb{P}(A_{k-1})$$

$$= \mathbb{P}(A_0) + (\mathbb{P}(A_1) - \mathbb{P}(A_0)) + (\mathbb{P}(A_2) - \mathbb{P}(A_1)) + ... + (\mathbb{P}(A_k) - \mathbb{P}(A_{k-1}))$$

$$= \mathbb{P}(A_k).$$

We arrive at

$$\mathbb{P}(A) = \sum_{j\geq 0} \mathbb{P}(B_k) = \lim_{k\to\infty} \sum_{0\leq j\leq k} \mathbb{P}(B_k) = \lim_{k\to\infty} \mathbb{P}(A_k)$$

Then

$$\lim_{n\to\infty} \mathbb{P}(A_n) = (A).$$

Taking the complements of the sets of Point (D), leads to the following point.

(E) (**Continuity Property of a Probability measure**) Let $(A_n)_{n\geq 0}$ be a sequence of no-increasing subsets of Ω to A, that is,

(1) For all $n \geq 0$, $A_{n+1} \subseteq A_n$,

and

(2) $\cap_{n\geq 0} A_n = A$.

Then $\mathbb{P}(A_n) \downarrow 0$ when $n \uparrow \infty$.

At this introductory level, we usually work with discrete probabilities defined on an enumerable space Ω. A probability measure on such a space is said to be discrete.

2.2. Characterization of a discrete probability measure. Let Card $\Omega \leq$ Card $\mathbb{N}$, meaning that Ω is enumerable, meaning also that we may write Ω in the form : $\Omega = \{\omega_1, \omega_2, ...\}$.

The following theorem allows to build a probability measure on discrete spaces.

Theorem Defining discrete probability measure $\mathbb{P}$ on Ω, is equivalent to providing numbers p_i, $1 \leq i$, such that $0 \leq p_i \leq 1$ and $p_1 + p_2 + ... = 1$ so that, for any subset of A of Ω,

$$\mathbb{P}(A) = \sum_{\omega_i \in A} p_i.$$

Proof. Let $\mathbb{P}$ be a probability measure on $\Omega = \{\omega_i, i \in I\}$, I $\subseteq \mathbb{N}$. Denote

$$\mathbb{P}(\{\omega_i\}) = p_i, i \in I.$$

We have

$$\forall (i \in I),\ 0 \leq p_i \leq 1 \tag{2.1}$$

and

$$\mathbb{P}(\Omega) = \sum_{i \in I} \mathbb{P}(\{\omega_i\}) = \sum_{i \in I} p_i = 1. \tag{2.2}$$

Moreover, if $A = \left\{\omega_{i_1}, \omega_{i_2}, ..., \omega_{i_j}, ..., j \in J\right\} \subseteq \Omega$, with $i_j \in I$, $J \subseteq I$, we get by additivity of $\mathbb{P}$,

$$\mathbb{P}(A) = \sum_{j \in J} \mathbb{P}(\{\omega_{ij}\}) = \sum_{j \in J} p_{i_j} = \sum_{\omega_i \in A} p_i.$$

It is clear that the knowledge of the numbers $(p_i)_{i\in I}$ allows to compute the probabilities $\mathbb{P}(A)$ for all subsets A of Ω.

Reversely, suppose that we are given numbers $(p_i)_{i\in I}$ such that (2.1) and (2.2) hold. Then the mapping $\mathbb{P}$ defined on $\mathcal{P}(\Omega)$ by

$$\mathbb{P}(\{\omega_{i_1}, ..., \omega_{i_k}\}) = \sum_{j=1}^{k} p_{i_j}$$

is a probability measure on $\mathcal{P}(\Omega)$.

3. equi-probability

The notion of equi-probability is very popular in probabilities in **finite** sample spaces. It means that on the finite sample space with size n, all the individual events have the equal probability $1/n$ to occur.

This happens in a fair lottery : if the lottery is based on picking $k = 7$ numbers out of $n = 40$ fixed numbers, all choices have the same probability of winning the max lotto.

We have the following rule.

Theorem. If a probability measure $\mathbb{P}$, that is defined of a finite sample set Ω with cardinality $n \geq 1$ with $\Omega = \{\omega_1, ..., \omega_n\}$, assigns the same probability to all the elementary events, then for all $1 \leq i \leq n$, we have,

$$\mathbb{P}(\{\omega_i\}) = \frac{1}{n}$$

and for $A \in \mathcal{P}(\Omega)$,

$$\mathbb{P}(A) = \frac{CardA}{n}$$

$$\mathbb{P}(A) = \frac{CardA}{Card\Omega}$$

$$= \frac{\text{number of favorable cases}}{\text{number of possible cases}}. \tag{3.1}$$

Proof. Suppose that for any $i \in [1,\ n]$, $\mathbb{P}(\{\omega_i\}) = p_i = p$, where p is a constant number between 0 and 1. This leads to $1 = p_1 + ... + p_n = np$. Then

$$p = \frac{1}{n}.$$

Let $A = \{\omega_{i_1}, ..., \omega_{i_k}\}$. We have,

$$\mathbb{P}(A) = p_{i_1} + ... + p_{i_k} = p + ... + p = \frac{k}{n} = \frac{CardA}{Card\Omega}.$$

Remark. In real situations, such as the lottery and the dice tossings, the equi-probability hypothesis is intuitively deduced, based on symmetry, geometry and logic properties. For example, in a new wedding couple, we use logic to say that : there is no reason that having a first

a girl as a first child is more likely that having a girl as a first child, and vice-verse. So we conclude that the probability of having a first child girl is one half.

In the situation of equi-probability, computing probabilities becomes simpler. Is is reduced to counting problems, based on the results of chapter 2.

In this situation, everything is based on Formula (3.1).

This explains the importance of Combinatorics in discrete Probability Theory.

Be careful. Even if equi-probability is popular, the contrary is also very common.

Example. A couple wants to have three children. The space is $\Omega = \{GGG, GGB, GBG, GBB, BGG, BGB, BBG, BBB\}$.

In the notation above, GGG is the elementary event that the couple has three girls, GBG is the event that the couple has first a girl, next a boy and finally a girl, etc.

We suppose the the eight individual events, that are characterized by the gender of the first, and the second and the third child, have equal probabilities of occurring.

Give the probabilities that :

(1) the couple has at least one boy.
(2) there is no girl older than a boy.
(3) the couple has exactly one girl.

Solution. Because of equi-probability, we only have to compute the cardinality of each event and, next use Formula (3.1).

(1) The event A=(the couple has exactly on boy) is :

$$A = \{GGB, GBG, GBB, BGG, BGB, BBG, BBB\}.$$

Then

$$\mathbb{P}(A) = \frac{\text{number of favorable cases}}{\text{number of possible cases}} = \frac{7}{8}$$

(2) The event B=(there is no girl older than a boy) is :

$$B = \{GGG, BGG, BBG, BBB\}.$$

Then

$$\mathbb{P}(A) = \frac{\text{number of favorable cases}}{\text{number of possible cases}} = \frac{4}{8} = \frac{1}{2}$$

(3) The event C=(The couple has exactly one girl) is :

$$C = \{GBB, BGB, BBG\}.$$

Then

$$\mathbb{P}(A) = \frac{\text{number of favorable cases}}{\text{number of possible cases}} = \frac{3}{8}.$$

CHAPTER 3

Conditional Probability and Independence

1. The notion of conditional probability

1.1. Introductory example. .

Suppose that we are tossing a die three times and considering the outcomes in the order of occurring. The set of all individual events Ω is the set of triplets (i, j, k), where i, j and k are, respectively the face that comes out in the first, in the second and in the third tossing, that is

$$\Omega = \{1, 2, ..., 6\}^3 = \{(i,\ j,\ k),\ 1 \leq j \leq 6,\ 1 \leq k \leq 6\}.$$

Denote by A the event **the sum of the three numbers i, j and k is six (6)** and by B the event : **the number 1 appears in the first tossing**. We have

$$\begin{aligned} A &= \left\{(i,j,k) \in \{1,2,...,6\}^3,\ i+j+k=6\right\} \\ &= \{(1,1,4),(1,2,3),(1,3,2),(1,4,1),(2,1,3),(2,2,2),(2,3,1),(3,1,2),(3,2,1),(4,1,4)\} \end{aligned}$$

and

$$\begin{aligned} B &= \left\{(i,j,k) \in \{1,2,...,6\}^3,\ i=1\right\} \\ &= \{1\} \times \{1,2,...,6\} \times \{1,2,...,6\} \end{aligned}$$

Remark that $Card(A) = 10$ and $Card(B) = 1 \times 6 \times 6 = 36$.

Suppose that we have two observers named **Observer 1** and **Observer 2**.

Observer 1 tosses the die three times and gets the outcome. Suppose the event A occurred. **Observer 1** knows that A is realized.

Observer 2, who is somewhat far from **Observer 1**, does not know. But **Observer 1** let him know that the event A occurred.

Now, given this information, **Observer 2** is willing to know the probability that B has occurred.

In this context, the event B can not occur out of A. The event A becomes the set of individual events, the sample space, with respect to **Observer 2**.

Then, the event B occurs if and only if $A \cap B$ occurs. Since we are in an equiprobability experience, from the point of view of **Observer 2**, the probability that B occurs **given** A already occurred, is

$$\frac{Card(B \cap A)}{CardA}.$$

This probability is the conditional probability of B **given** A, denoted by $\mathbb{P}(B/A)$ or $\mathbb{P}_A(B)$:

$$\mathbb{P}_A(B) = \frac{Card(A \cap B)}{Card(A)} = \frac{\mathbb{P}(\mathbb{A} \cap \mathbb{B})}{\mathbb{P}(\mathbb{A})}$$

In the current case,

$$A \cap B = \{(1,1,4),(1,2,3),(1,3,2),(1,4,1)\}$$

and then

$$\mathbb{P}_A(B) = \frac{4}{10} = \frac{2}{5},$$

which is different of the unconditional probability of B :

$$\mathbb{P}(B) = \frac{6}{6 \times 6 \times 6 \times} = \frac{1}{36}.$$

Based on that example, we may give the general definitions pertaining of the conditional probability concept.

Theorem 1. (Definition). Let $(\Omega, \mathcal{P}(\Omega), \mathbb{P})$ a probability space. For any event A such that $\mathbb{P}(A) > 0$, the application

$$\begin{array}{rccc} \mathbb{P}_A : & \mathcal{P}(\Omega) & \longmapsto & [0,1] \\ & B & \hookrightarrow & \mathbb{P}_A(B) = \mathbb{P}(\mathbb{B}/A) = \mathbb{P}(A \cap B)/\mathbb{P}(A) \end{array}$$

is a probability measure. It is supported by A, meaning that we have $\mathbb{P}_A(A) = 1$. The application $\mathbb{P}_A$ is called the conditional probability **given** A.

Proof. Let A satisfy $\mathbb{P}(A) > 0$. We have for all $B \in \Omega$,

$$A \cap B \subseteq A.$$

Then

$$\mathbb{P}(A \cap B) \leq \mathbb{P}(A)$$

and next,

$$\mathbb{P}_A(B) \leq 1.$$

It is also clear that A is a support of the probability measure $\mathbb{P}_A$, meaning that

$$\mathbb{P}_A(A) = 1,$$

since

$$\mathbb{P}_A(A) = \mathbb{P}(A \cap B)/\mathbb{P}(A) = \mathbb{P}(A)/\mathbb{P}(A) = 1.$$

It is also obvious that

$$\mathbb{P}_A \geq 0.$$

Further if $B = \sum_{j\geq 1} B_j$, we have

$$A \cap (\sum B_j) = \sum_{j\geq 1} A \cap B_j.$$

By applying the additivity of $\mathbb{P}$, we get

$$\mathbb{P}(A \cap (\sum_{j\geq 1} B_j)) = \sum_{j\geq 1} \mathbb{P}(A \cap B_j).$$

By dividing by $\mathbb{P}$(A), we arrive at

$$\mathbb{P}_A(\sum_{j\geq 1} B_j) = \sum_{j\geq 1} \mathbb{P}_A(B_j).$$

Hence $\mathbb{P}_A$ is a probability measure.

Theorem 2. For all events A and B such that $\mathbb{P}(A) > 0$, we have

$$\mathbb{P}(A \cap B) = \mathbb{P}(A) \times \mathbb{P}(B/A). \tag{1.1}$$

Moreover, for any family of events A_1, A_2, . . ., A_n, we have

$$\mathbb{P}(A_1 \cap A_2 \cap .....A_n). \tag{1.2}$$

$$= \mathbb{P}(A_1) \times \mathbb{P}(A_2/A_1) \times \mathbb{P}(A_3/A_1 \cap A_2) \times ... \times \mathbb{P}(A_n/A_1 \cap A_2 \cap ... \cap A_{n-1}),$$

with the convention that $\mathbb{P}_A(B) = 0$ for any event B, whenever we have $\mathbb{P}(A) = 0$.

Formula (1.2) is the **progressive conditionning formula** which is very useful when dealing with Markov chains.

Proof. The first formula (1.1) is a rephrasing of the conditional probability for $\mathbb{P}(A) > 0$.

Next, we do understand from the example that, **given** an impossible event A, no event B can occur since $A \cap B$ is still impossible and $\mathbb{P}(B/A) = 0$ for any event B when $\mathbb{P}(A) = 0$. So, Formula (1.1) still holds when $\mathbb{P}(A) = 0$.

As to the second formula (1.2), we get it by iterating Formula (1.1) n times :

$$\mathbb{P}(A_1 \cap A_2 \cap ... \cap A_n) = \mathbb{P}(A_1 \cap A_2 \cap ... \cap A_{n-1}) \times \mathbb{P}(A_n/A_1 \cap A_2 \cap ... \cap A_{n-1}).$$

We are going to introduce a very important formula. This formula is very important in the applications of Probability Theory.

2. Bayes Formula

2.1. Statement. Consider a partition $E_1, E_2, ..., E_k$ of Ω, that is, the E_i are disjoint and fulfill the relation

$$\sum_{1 \leq i \leq k} E_i = \Omega.$$

The causes.

If we have the partition of Ω in the form $\sum_{1 \leq i \leq k} E_i = \Omega$, we call the events E_i's the causes and the numbers $\mathbb{P}(E_i)$ the *prior probabilities*.

Consider an arbitrary event B, we have by the distributivity of the intersection over the union, that

$$B = \Omega \cap B = (E_1 + E_2 + ... + E_k) \cap B = E_1 \cap B + ... + E_k \cap B.$$

From the formula

$$B = E_1 \cap B + ... + E_k \cap B, \tag{2.1}$$

we say that : for B to occur, each cause E_i contributes by the part $E_i \cap B$. The denomination of the E_i as causes follows from this fact.

The first important formula is the following.

Total Probabilities Formula.

Suppose that the sample space Ω is partionned into causes E_1, ..., E_k, then for any event B,

$$\mathbb{P}(B) = \sum_{j=1}^{k} \mathbb{P}\left(B/E_j\right)\ \mathbb{P}(E_j). \tag{2.2}$$

Preuve. Let B be an arbitrary event. By Formula (2.1) and by the additivity of the probability, we have

$$\mathbb{P}(B) = \sum_{j=1}^{k} \mathbb{P}(E_j \cap B). \tag{2.3}$$

By applying the conditional probability as in Theorem 2 above, we have for each $j \in \{1, ..., k\}$

$$\mathbb{P}(E_j \cap B) = \mathbb{P}(E_j)\mathbb{P}(B/E_j).$$

By combining these two formulas, we arrive at

$$\mathbb{P}(B) = \sum_{j=1}^{k} \mathbb{P}\left(B/E_j\right)\ \mathbb{P}(E_j).$$

QED.

The Total Probability Formula allows us to find the probability of a future event B, called *effect*, by collecting the contributions of the causes E_i, $i = 1, ..., k$.

The Bayes rule intends to invert this process in the following sense : Given an event B has occurred, what is the probable cause which made B occur. The Bayes rule, in this case, computes the probability that each causes occurred prior to B.

Bayes Theorem. Suppose that *prior probabilities* are positive, that is $\mathbb{P}(E_i) > 0$ for each $1 \leq i \leq k$. Then, for any $1 \leq i \leq k$, for any event B, we have

$$\mathbb{P}\left(E_i/B\right) = \frac{\mathbb{P}(E_i)\ \mathbb{P}\left(B/E_i\right)}{\sum_{j=1}^{k} \mathbb{P}(E_j)\ \mathbb{P}\left(B/E_j\right)}. \tag{2.4}$$

The formula computes the probability that the cause E_i occurred given the effect B. We will come back to the important interpretations of this formula. Right now, let us give the proof.

Proof. Direct manipulations of the conditional probability lead to

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{P}\left(E_i/B\right) &= \frac{\mathbb{P}(E_i \cap B)}{\mathbb{P}(B)} \\ &= \frac{\mathbb{P}(E_i)\mathbb{P}\left(B/E_i\right)}{\mathbb{P}(\mathbb{B})} \end{aligned}$$

We finish by replacing $\mathbb{P}(B)$ by its value using the total probability formula.

Now, let us mention some interpretations of this rule.

2.2. Implications of the Total Probabilities Formula. The Total Probability Formula shows how each cause contributes in forming the probability of future events called effects.

The Bayes rule does the inverse way. From the effect, what are the probabilities that the causes have occured prior to the effect.

It is like we may invert the *past* and the *future*. But we must avoid to enter into philosophical problems regarding the past and the future.

The context of the Bayes rule is clear. All is about to the past. The effect has occurred at a time t_1 in the past. This first is the future of a second time t_2 at which one of the causes ocurred. The application of the Bayes rule for the future leads to pure speculations.

Now, we need to highlight an interesting property of the Bayes rules for two equally probable causes. In this case, denote $p = \mathbb{P}(E_1) = \mathbb{P}(E_2)$. We have

$$\mathbb{P}\left(E_1/B\right) = \frac{p\ \mathbb{P}\left(B/E_1\right)}{\mathbb{P}(E_1)\ \mathbb{P}\left(B/E_1\right) + \mathbb{P}(E_2)\ \mathbb{P}(\mathbb{B}/\mathbb{E}_2)},$$

and

$$\mathbb{P}\left(E_2/B\right) = \frac{p\ \mathbb{P}\left(B/E_2\right)}{\mathbb{P}(E_1)\ \mathbb{P}\left(B/E_1\right) + \mathbb{P}(E_2)\ \mathbb{P}(\mathbb{B}/\mathbb{E}_2)},$$

and then

$$\frac{\mathbb{P}\left(E_1/B\right)}{\mathbb{P}\left(E_2/B\right)} = \frac{\mathbb{P}\left(B/E_1\right)}{\mathbb{P}\left(B/E_2\right)}.$$

Conclusion. For two equiprobable causes, the ratio of the conditional probabilities of the causes given the effect is the same as the ratio of the conditional probabilities of the effect given the causes.

Both the Bayes Formula and the Total Probabilities Formula are very useful in a huge number of real problems. Here are some examples.

Example.

Example 1. (The umbrella problem). An umbrella is in one the sept floors of a building with probability $0 \leq p \leq 1$. Precisely, it is in each floor with propbability $p/7$. We searched it in the first six floors without success so that we are sure it is not in these first six floors. What is the probability that the umbrella is in the seventh floor?

Solution. Denote by E_i the event : *The umbrella is in the i-th floor.* The event

$$E_1 + ... + E_7 = E$$

is the event : *The imbrella is the building* and we have

$$\mathbb{P}(E) = p.$$

Denote by $F = E_1 + ... + E_6$ the event : *The umbrella is in one of the six first floors.* We see that

$$F^c = E_1^c \cap .... \cap E_6^c$$

is the event : *The umbrella is not in the six first floors.*

The searched probability is the conditional probability :

$$Q = \mathbb{P}\left(E_7/F^c\right) = \frac{\mathbb{P}(E_7 \cap F^c)}{\mathbb{P}(F^c)}.$$

We also have

$$F^c = E_7 + E^c.$$

Then

$$E_7 \subseteq F^c,$$

which implies that

$$E_7 \cap F^c = E_7.$$

We arrive at

$$Q = \mathbb{P}\left(E_7/F^c\right) = \frac{\mathbb{P}(E_7)}{\mathbb{P}(F^c)}.$$

But

$$\mathbb{P}(F^c) = \mathbb{P}(E_7 + E^c) = (p/7) + (1 - 6) = (7 - 6p)/7.$$

Hence

$$Q = \mathbb{P}\left(E_7/F^c\right) = (p/7)/((7 - 6p)/7) = \frac{p}{7 - 6p}. \tag{2.5}$$

We remark $Q = 1$ for $p = 1$. The interpretation is simple. If $p = 1$, we are sure that the umbrella is in one of the seven floors. If it is not the six first floors, it is surely, that is with probability one, in the seventh.

Exemple 2. (Detection of decease). In one farm, a medical test T is set to detect infected animals by some decease D.

We have the following facts :

(a) The probability that one animal infected by D is $p = 0.3$.

(b) For an infected animal, the probability that the test T declares it positive is $r = 0.9$.

(c) For a healthy animal, the probability that the test T declares it negative is $r = 0.8$.

Question. An animal which is randomly picked has been tested and declared positive by the test T. What is the probability that it is really infected by D.

Solution. Let us introduce the following events :

PR : *the animal positively responds to the test* T

NR : *the animal negatively responds to the test* T

D : *the animal is infected by* D

We are asked to find the number $\mathbb{P}(D/PR)$.

We have $\Omega = D + D^c$. The two causes are D and D^c. We may use the Bayes rule :

$$\mathbb{P}\left(M/RP\right) = \frac{\mathbb{P}(D)\ \mathbb{P}\left(RP/D\right)}{\mathbb{P}(M)\ \mathbb{P}\left(RP/M\right) + \mathbb{P}(D^c)\ \mathbb{P}\left(RP/D^c\right)}$$

We are given above : $\mathbb{P}\left(D\right) = 0.3$, $\mathbb{P}\left(RP/D\right) = 0.9$, $\mathbb{P}\left(NR/D^c\right) = 0.8$

We infer that $\mathbb{P}\left(D^c\right) = 0.7$ and

$$\mathbb{P}\left(PR/D^c\right) = 1 - \mathbb{P}\left(NR/D^c\right) = 1 - 0.9 = 0.1$$

We conclude

$$\mathbb{P}\left(M/RP\right) = \frac{(0.3 \times 0.8)}{(0.3 \times 0.2 + 0.7 \times 0.1)} = 0.77$$

We are going to speak about the concept of independence, that is closely related to what preceeds.

3. Independence

Definition. Let A_1, A_2, . . . , A_n be events in a probability space $(\Omega, \mathcal{P}(\Omega), \mathbb{P})$. We have the following definitions.

(A) The events A_1, A_2, . . . , A_{n-1} and A_n are pairwise independent if and only if

$$\mathbb{P}(A_i \cap A_j) = \mathbb{P}(A_i)\ \mathbb{P}(A_j), \text{ for all } 1 \leq i \neq j \leq n.$$

(B) The events A_1, A_2, . . ., A_{n-1} and A_n are mutually independent if and only if for any subset $\{i_1, i_2, ..., i_k\}$ of $\{1, 2, ..., n\}$, with $2 \leq k \leq n$, we have

$$\mathbb{P}(A_{i_1} \cap A_{i_2} \cap ... \cap A_{i_k}) = \mathbb{P}(A_{i_1})\ \mathbb{P}(A_{i_2})...\mathbb{P}(A_{i_k}).$$

(C) Finally, the events A_1, A_2, . . ., A_{n-1} and A_n fulfills the global factorization formula if and only if

$$\mathbb{P}(A_1 \cap A_2 \cap ... \cap A_n) = \mathbb{P}(A_1)\ \mathbb{P}(A_2)...\mathbb{P}(A_n).$$

Remarks.

(1) For two events, the three definitions (A), (B) and (C) coincide for $k = 2$.

(2) For more that two events, independence without any further indication, means mutual independence.

(3) Formula (B) means that the elements of A_1, A_2, . . ., A_{n-1} and A_n satisfy the factorization formula for any sub-collection of A_1, A_2, . . ., A_{n-1} and A_n of size 2, 3, ..., n.

3.1. Properties. . These two following remarks give the linkage between the independence and the conditional probability related to two events.

(P1) A and B are independent if and only if

$$\mathbb{P}(A \cap B) = \mathbb{P}(A)\mathbb{P}(B).$$

(P2) If $\mathbb{P}(A \cap B) = \mathbb{P}(A)P(B)$ and $\mathbb{P}(A) \neq 0$, then $\mathbb{P}\left(B/A\right) = \mathbb{P}(B)$.

In other words, if B and A are independent, the conditional probability B given A, does not depend on A : it remains equal to the unconditional probability of B.

3.2. Intuitive Independence and Mathematical independence. Stricly speaking, proving the independence requires checking the formula (B). But in many real situations, the context itself allows us to say that we intituively have independence.

Example. We toss a die three times. We are sure that the outcomes from one tossing are independent of that of the two other tossings. This means that the outcome of the second tossing is not influenced by the result of the first tossing nor does it influence the outcome of the third tossing. Let us consider the following events.

A : The first tossing gives an even number.

B : The number of the face occurring in the second tossing is diffetent from 1 and is a perfect square [that is, its square root is an integer number].

C : The last occurring number is a multiple of 3.

The context of the current experience tells us that these events are independent and we have

$$\mathbb{P}(A) = Card\{1,3,5\}/6 = 1/2,$$

$$\mathbb{P}(B) = Card\{4\}/6 = 1/6,$$

$$\mathbb{P}() = Card\{3,6\}/6 = 1/3,$$

$$\mathbb{P}(A \cap B) = \mathbb{P}(A)\mathbb{P}(B) = (1/2)(1/6) = 1/12,$$

$$\mathbb{P}(A \cap C) = \mathbb{P}(A)\mathbb{P}(C) = (1/2)(1/3) = 1/6,$$

$$\mathbb{P}(B \cap C) = \mathbb{P}(B)\ \mathbb{P}(C) = (1/6)(1/3) = 1/18,$$

and

$$\mathbb{P}(A \cap B \cap C) = \mathbb{P}(B)\mathbb{P}(B)\mathbb{P}(C) = \frac{1}{2} \times \frac{1}{6} \times \frac{1}{3} = \frac{1}{36}.$$

3.3. Comparison between the concepts in the definition. .

It is obvious that mutual independence implies the pairwise disjoint independence and the global factorization formula.

But neither of the pairwise independence nor the global factorization formula implies the mutual independence.

Here are counter-examples, from the book by Stayonov [**13**] that is entirely devoted to counter-examples in Probability and Statistics.

3.3.1. **Counter-example 1**. *(Bernstein, 1928).* The following counter-example shows that the pairwise independence does not imply the global factorization, and then does not imply the mutual independence.

A urn contains (4) four cards, respectively holding of the following numbers : 112, 121, 211, and 222.

We want to pick one card at random. Consider the events.

A_i : *the number 1 (one) is at the i-th place in the number of the card*, $i = 1, 2, 3$.

We have

$$\mathbb{P}(A_1) = \mathbb{P}(A_2) = \mathbb{P}(A_3) = \frac{2}{4} = \frac{1}{2},$$

$$\mathbb{P}(A_1 \cap A_2) = \mathbb{P}(A_1A_3) = \mathbb{P}(A_2A_3) = \frac{1}{4}.$$

Yet, we have

$$\mathbb{P}(A_1 \cap A_2 \cap A_3) = 0 \neq \mathbb{P}(A_1)\ P(A_2)\ \mathbb{P}(A_3) = \frac{1}{8}.$$

We have pairwise independence and not the mutual independance.

3.3.2. **Counter-example 2**. The following counter-example shows that the global factorization property does not imply the pairwise independence, and then, the global factorization formula does not imply the mutual independence.

Exemple: We toss a die twice. The probability space is $\Omega = \{1, 2, ..., 6\}^2$. Consider the events :

A : *The first tossing gives 1, 2, 3.*

B : *The second gives donne 4, 5, 6.*

and

C : *The sums of the two numbers is 9.*

We have :

$$Card(A) = 3 \times 6 = 18 \text{ and then } \mathbb{P}(A) = \frac{18}{36} = \frac{1}{2},$$

$$Card(B) = 3 \times 6 = 18 \text{ and then } \mathbb{P}(B) = \frac{18}{36} = \frac{1}{2}$$

and

$$Card(C) = 4 \text{ and then } \mathbb{P}(C) = \frac{4}{36} = \frac{1}{9}.$$

We also have

$$Card(A \cap B) = 9,$$

$$Card(A \cap C) = 1,$$

$$Card(B \cap C) = 3,$$

and

$$A \cap B \cap C = B \cap (A \cap C) = \{(3, 6)\}.$$

Then, we have

$$\mathbb{P}(A \cap B \cap C) = \frac{1}{36}$$

and we have the global factorization

$$\mathbb{P}(A)\mathbb{P}(B)\mathbb{P}(C) = \frac{1}{2} \times \frac{1}{2} \times \frac{1}{9} = \frac{1}{36} = \mathbb{P}(A \cap B \cap C).$$

But we do not have the pairwise independence since

$$\mathbb{P}(B \cap C) = \frac{3}{36} = \frac{1}{12} \quad \neq \quad \mathbb{P}(B)\mathbb{P}(C) = \frac{1}{2} \times \frac{1}{9} = \frac{1}{18}.$$

Conclusion. The chapters 3 and 4 are enough to solve a huge number of problems in elementary Probability Theory provided enough mathematical tools of Analysis and Algebra are mastered. You will have the great and numerous opportunities to practice with the Exercises book related to this monograph.

CHAPTER 4

Random Variables

1. Introduction

We begin with definitions, examples and notations.

Definition 1. Let $(\Omega, \mathcal{P}(\Omega), \mathbb{P})$ be a probability space. A random variable on $(\Omega, \mathcal{P}(\Omega), \mathbb{P})$ is an application X from Ω to $\mathbb{R}^k$.

If $k = 1$, we say that X is a **real-valued random variable**, abbreviated in (rrv).

If $k = 2$, X is a **random couple** or a **bi-dimensional random variable**.

If the general case, X is a random variable of k dimensions, or a k-**dimensional random variable**, or simply a **random vector**.

If X takes a finite number of distinct values (points) in $\mathbb{R}^k$, X is said to be a **random variable with finite number of values**.

If X takes its values in a set $\mathcal{V}_X$ that can be written in an enumerable form :

$$\mathcal{V}_X = \{x_1, x_2, x_3, ...\},$$

the random variable is said to be a **discrete random variable**. So, any random variable with finite number of values is a discrete random variable.

Examples 1. Let us toss twice a die whose faces are numbered from 1 to 6. Let X be the addition of the two occuring numbers. Then X is a real-valued random defined on

$$\Omega = \{1, 2, ..., 6\}^2$$

such that $X((i, j)) = i + j$.

Let us consider the same experience and let Y be the application on Ω defined by

$$Z((i,j)) = (i+2j, i/(1+j), (i+j)/(1+|i-j|).$$

Y is a random vector of dimension $k=3$. Both X and Y have a finite number of values.

Example 2. Consider a passenger arriving at a bus station and beginning to wait for a bus to pick him up to somewhere. Let Ω be the set all possible passengers. Let X be the time a passenger has to waits before the next bus arrives at the station.

This random variable is not discrete, since its values are positive real numbers $t > 0$. This set of values is an interval of $\mathbb{R}$. It is not enumarable (See a course of calculus).

Notations. Let $X : \Omega \mapsto \mathbb{R}^k$ be a random vector and $A \subseteq \mathbb{R}^k$, a subset of $\mathbb{R}^k$. Let us define the following events

$$(X \in A) = X^{-1}(A) = \{\omega \in \Omega,\ X(\omega) \in A\}, \tag{1.1}$$

The set A usually takes particular forms we introduce below :

$$(X \leq x) = X^{-1}\ (]-\infty,\ x]\ ) = \{\omega \in \Omega,\ X(\omega) \leq x\},$$

$$(X < x) = X^{-1}(\ ]-\infty,\ x[) = \{\omega \in \Omega,\ X(\omega) < x\}$$

$$(X \geq x) = X^{-1}\ ([x,\ +\infty[) = \{\omega \in \Omega,\ X(\omega) \geq x\}$$

$$(X > x) = X^{-1}\ (]\ x,\ +\infty[) = \{\omega \in \Omega,\ X(\omega) > x\}$$

$$(X = x) = X^{-1}(\ \{x\}\ ) = \{\omega \in \Omega,\ X(\omega) = x\}$$

These notations are particular forms of Formula (1.1). We suggest that you try to give more other specific forms by letting A taking particular sets.

Exercise

(a) Let X be a real random variable. Extend the list of the notation in the same form for
$A = [a, b]$, $A = [a, b[$, $A =]a, b[$, $A = \{0\}[$, $A = \{1, 2\}[$, $A = \{]1, 2[\cup \{5, 10\}$.
(b) Let (X, Y) be a random vectors. Define the sets $((X, Y) \in A)$ with

$$A = \{(x, y), x \leq a, y \geq b\},$$

$$A = \{(x, y), y = x + 1\}$$

$$A = \{(x, y), \frac{x}{1 + x^2 + y^2} \geq 1\}$$

$$A = 1 \times [1, +\infty[,$$

or

$$A = 1 \times [1, 10].$$

Important Reminder. We remind that the reciprocal image application (or inverse image application) X^{-1} preserves all sets operations (See a course of general Algebra). In particular, we have

$$X^{-1}(A) \cap X^{-1}(B) = X^{-1}(A \cap B),$$

$$X^{-1}(A^c) = X^{-1}(A)^c,$$

$$X^{-1}(A) \cup X^{-1}(B) = X^{-1}(A \cup B),$$

$$X^{-1}(A \setminus B) = X^{-1}(A) \setminus X^{-1}(B).$$

In Probability theory, we have to compute the probability that events occur. But for random variables, we compute the probability that this random variable takes a particular value or fall in a specific region of $\mathbb{R}^k$. This is what we are going to go. But, in this first level of Probability Theory, we will mainly focus on the real case where $k = 1$.

2. Probability Distributions of Random Variables

At this preliminary stage, we focus on discrete random variables.

Definition 2. Let X be a discrete random variable defined on the probability space Ω onto $\mathcal{V}(X) = \{x_i,\ i \in I\} \subseteq \mathbb{R}^k$, where I is a subset of the set of non-negative integers $\mathbb{N}$. The probability law of X, is characterized the number

$$\mathbb{P}(X = x_i),\ i \in I.$$

These numbers satisfy

$$\sum_{i \in I} \mathbb{P}(X = x_i) = 1. \tag{2.1}$$

Remarks.

(1) We may rephrase the definition in these words : when you are asked to give the probability law of X, you have to provide the numbers in Formula (2) and you have to check that Formula (2.1) holds.

(2) The set I is usually $\mathbb{N}$ or a finite set of it, of the form $I = \{1, 2, ..., m\}$ where m is finite.

Direct Example.

The probability law may be given by explicitly stating Formula (2). When the values set is finite and moderate, it is possible to use a table. For example, consider the real-valued random variable of the age of a student in the first year of high school. Suppose that X takes the values 17, 18, 19, 20, 21 with probabilities 0.18, 0.22, 0.28, 0.22, 0.10. We may represent its probability in the following table

Values x_i	17	18	19	20	21	Total
$\mathbb{P}(X = x_i)$	$\frac{18}{100}$	$\frac{22}{100}$	$\frac{28}{100}$	$\frac{22}{100}$	$\frac{10}{100}$	$\frac{100}{100}$

Formula (2.1), as suggests its name, enables the computation of the probability that X fall in any specific area of $\mathbb{R}^k$. Indeed, we have the following result.

THEOREM 2. *Let X be a discrete random variable defined of Ω with values in $\mathcal{V}(X) = \{x_i,\ i \in I\} \subseteq \mathbb{R}^k$. Then for any subset of $\mathbb{R}^k$, the probability that X falls in A is given by*

$$\mathbb{P}(X \in A) = \sum_{i \in I, x_i \in A} \mathbb{P}(X = x_i).$$

Proof. We have

$$\Omega = \sum_{i \in I} (X = x_i).$$

For any subset A of $\mathbb{R}^k$, $(X \in A)$ is a subset of Ω, and then

$$(X \in A) = (X \in A) \cap \Omega = \sum_{i \in I} (X \in A) \cap (X = x_i). \tag{2.2}$$

For each $i \in I$, we have :

Either $x_i \in A$ and in this case, $(X = x_i) \subseteq (X \in A)$,

Or, $x_i \notin A$ and in this case, $(X \in A) \cap (X = x_i) = \emptyset$.

Then, we finally have

$$(X \in A) = \sum_{x_i \in A} (X = x_i).$$

We conclude the proof by applying the additivity of the probability measure $\mathbb{P}$.

We seize the opportunity to extend Formula (2.2) into a general principle.

If X is a discrete random variables taking the values x_i, $i \in I$, then for any event $B \subset \Omega$, we have the following decomposition formula

$$B = \sum_{i \in I} B \cap (X = x_i). \tag{2.3}$$

A considerable part of Probability Theory consists of finding probability laws. So, we have to begin to learn the usual and unavoidable cases.

3. Probability laws of Usual Random Variables

We are going to give a list of some probability laws including the very usual ones. For each case, we describe a random experience that generates such a random variable. It is very important to perfectly understand these experiences and to know the results by heart, if possible, for subsequent more advanced courses in Probability Theory.

(1) Degenerated or Constant Random variable.

It is amazing to say that an element c of $\mathbb{R}^k$ is a random variable. Indeed, the application $X : \Omega \mapsto \mathbb{R}^k$, such that

$$\text{For any } \omega \in \Omega, \quad X(\omega) = c,$$

is the constant application that assigns to any ω the same value c. Even if X is not *variable* (in the common language), it is a random variable in the sense of an application.

We have in this case : $\mathcal{V}(X) = \{c\}$ and the probability law is given by

$$\mathbb{P}(X = c) = 1. \tag{3.1}$$

In a usual terminology, we say that X is degenerated.

In the remainder of this text, we focus on real-valued-random variables.

(2) Discrete Uniform Random variable.

A Discrete Uniform Random variable X with parameter $n \geq 1$, denoted by $X \sim \mathcal{DU}(n)$, takes its values in a set of n elements $\mathcal{V}(X) = \{x_1,\ x_2, .., x_n\}$ such that

$$\mathbb{P}(X = x_i) = \frac{1}{n},\ i = 1, ..., n.$$

Generation. Consider a urn **U** in which we have n balls that are numbered from 1 to n and indistinguishable by hand. We want to draw at random on ball from the urn and consider the random number X of

the ball that will be drawn.

We identify the balls with their numbers and we have $\mathcal{V}(X) = \{1,\ 2.....,n\}$.

We clearly see that all the n balls will have the same probability of occurring, that is $1/n$. Then,

$$\mathbb{P}(X = i) = \frac{1}{n},\ i = 1, ..., n. \tag{3.2}$$

Clearly, the addition of the probabilities in (3.2) gives the unity.

(3) Bernoulli Random variable $\mathcal{B}$(p), $0 <\ p <\ 1$.

A Bernoulli random variable X with parameter p, $0 < p < 1$, denoted by $X \sim \mathcal{B}(p)$, takes its values in $\mathcal{V}(X) = \{0,\ 1\}$ and

$$\mathbb{P}(X = 1) = p = 1 - \mathbb{P}(X = 0). \tag{3.3}$$

X is called a success-failure random variable. The value one is associated with a success and the value zero with a failure.

Generation. A urn **U** contains N black balls and M red balls, all of them have the same form and are indistinguishable by hand touch. We draw at random one ball. Let X be the random variable that takes the value 1 (one) if the drawn ball is red and 0 (zero) otherwise.

It is clear that we have : $X \sim \mathcal{B}(p)$ with $p = M/(N + M)$.

(4) Binomial Random variable $\mathcal{B}(n, p)$ with parameters $n \geq 1$ and $p \in]0, 1[$

A random Bernoulli random variable X with parameters $n \geq 1$ and $p \in]0, 1[$, denoted by $X \sim \mathcal{B}(p)$, takes its values in

$$\mathcal{V}(X) = \{0, 1, ..., n\}$$

and

$$\mathbb{P}(X = k) = C_n^k\ p^k\ (1 - p)^{n-k},\quad 0 \geq k \geq n. \tag{3.4}$$

Generation. Consider a Bernoulli experience with probability p. For example, we may consider again a urn with $N+M$ similar balls, N being black and M red, with $p = M/(N+M)$. We are going to draw one ball at random, note down the color of the drawn ball and put it back in the urn. We repeat this experience n times. Finally, we consider the number of times X a red ball has been drawn.

In general, we consider a Bernoulli experience of probability of success p and **independently** repeat this experience n times. After n repetitions, let X be the number of successes.

It is clear that X takes its values in

$$\mathcal{V}(X) = \{0, 1....., n\},$$

and X follows a Binomial law with parameters $n \geq 1$ and $p \in]0, 1[$.

Proof. We have to compute $\mathbb{P}(X = k)$ for $k = 0, ..., n$. We say that the event $(X = k)$ is composed by all permutations of n elements with repetition of the following particular elementary event

$$\omega_0 = \underbrace{RR...R}_{k \text{ fois}} \underbrace{NN...N}_{n-k \text{ times}},$$

where k elements are identical and $n-k$ others are identical and different from those of the first group. By independence, all these permutations with repetition have the same individual probability

$$p^k (1-p)^{n-k}.$$

And the number of permutations with repetition of n elements with two distinguishable groups of indistinguishable elements of respective sizes of k and $n-k$ is

$$\frac{n!}{k!\ (n-k)!}$$

Then, by the additivity of the probability measure, we have

$$\mathbb{P}(X = k) = \frac{n!}{k!\ (n-k)!} p^k (1-p)^{n-k}.$$

which is (3.4).

(5) Hypergeometric Random Variable $\mathcal{H}(N, r, \theta)$)

A Hypergeometric Random Variable X with parameter $N \geq 1$, $1 \leq r \leq N$, and $\theta \in]0,1[$ takes its values in

$$\mathcal{V}(X) = \{0, 1, ..., min(r, N\theta)\}$$

and

$$\mathbb{P}(X = k) = \frac{\begin{pmatrix} N\theta \\ k \end{pmatrix} \times \begin{pmatrix} N(1-\theta) \\ r-k \end{pmatrix}}{\begin{pmatrix} N \\ r \end{pmatrix}}. \tag{3.5}$$

Generation. Consider a urn containing N similar balls and exactly M of these balls are black, with $0 < M < N$. We want to draw without replacement $r \geq 1$ balls from the urn with $r \leq N$. Let X be the number of black balls drawn out of the r balls. Put

$$\theta = M/N \in]0,1[.$$

It is clear that X is less than r and less that M since a drawn ball is not put back in the urn. So the values taken by X is

$$\mathcal{V}(X) = \{0, 1, ..., min(r, N\theta)\}$$

.

Now, when we do not take the order into account, drawing r balls without replacement from the urn is equivalent to drawing at once the r balls at the same time. So, our draw is simply a combination and all the combinations of r elements from N elements have equal probabilities of occurring. Our problem becomes a counting one : In how many ways can we choose a combination of r elements from the urn with exactly k black balls? It is enough to choose k balls among the black ones and $r-k$ among the non black. The total numbers of combination is

$$\begin{pmatrix} N \\ r \end{pmatrix}$$

and the number of favorable cases to the event $(X = k)$ is

$$\begin{pmatrix} M \\ k \end{pmatrix} \times \begin{pmatrix} N-M \\ r-k \end{pmatrix}.$$

So, we have

$$\mathbb{P}(X=k)=\frac{\left(\begin{array}{c}M\\k\end{array}\right)\times\left(\begin{array}{c}N-M\\r-k\end{array}\right)}{\left(\begin{array}{c}N\\r\end{array}\right)}.$$

We replace M by $N\theta$ and get (3.5).

(6) Geometric Random Variable $\mathcal{G}(p)$.

A Geometric random variable Y_1 with parameter $p\in]0,1[$, denoted by $X\sim\mathcal{G}(p)$, takes its values in

$$\mathcal{V}(X_1)=\{1,2,.....\}$$

and

$$\mathbb{P}(Y_1=n)=p(1-p)^{n-1},\ n\geq 1. \tag{3.6}$$

Remark. The Geometric random variable is the first example of random variable with an infinite number of values.

Generation. Consider a Bernoulli experience with parameter $p\in]0,1[$ which is independently repeated. We decide to repeat the experience until we get a success. Let X be the number of repetitions we need to have one (1) success.

Of course, we have to do at least one experience to hope to get a success. Hence,

$$\mathcal{V}(X_1)=\{1,2,...\}.$$

Now, the event $(Y_1=n)$ requires that we have failures in first $(n-1)$ experiences and a success at the n^{th} experience. We represent this event by

$$(Y_1=k)=\underbrace{FF.....F}_{(n-1)\ times}\ S.$$

Then, we have by independence,

$$\mathbb{P}(Y_1=n)=p(1-p)^{n-1},\ n=1,\ 2,.....$$

Now, consider $X = Y_1 - 1$. We see that X is the number of failures before de first success.

The values set of X is $\mathbb{N}$ and

$$\mathbb{P}(X = n) = (1-p)^n p,\ n = 0, 1,\ 2, ..., \tag{3.7}$$

since

$$\mathbb{P}(X_1 = n) = \mathbb{P}(Y_1 = n+1) = (1-p)^n p,\ n = 0, 1,\ 2, ...$$

Nota-Bene. Certainly, you are asking yourself why we used a subscript in Y_1. The reason is that we are working here for one success. In a coming subsection, we will work with $k > 1$ successes and Y_k will stand for the number of independent repetitions of the Bernoulli experience we need to ensure exactly k successes.

Before we do this, let us learn a nice property of Geometric random variables.

Loss of memory property. Let $X - 1$ follow a geometric law $\mathcal{G}(p)$. We are going to see that, for $m \geq 0$ and $n \geq 0$, the probability that $X = n + m$ given that X has already exceeded n, depends only on m, and is still equal to the probability that $X = m$:

$$\mathbb{P}\left(X = n + m / X > n\right) = \mathbb{P}(X => n)$$

Indeed, we have

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathbb{P}(X \geq n) &= \mathbb{P}(\bigcup_{r \geq n}(X = r)) \\
&= \sum_{r \geq n} p(1-p)^r \\
&= p(1-p)^n \sum_{r \geq n}(1-p)^{r-n} \\
&= p(1-p)^n \sum_{s \geq 0}(1-p)^s \text{ (by change of variable } s = n - r) \\
&= p(1-p)^n (1/p) = (1-p)^n.
\end{aligned}$$

Then for $m \geq 0$ and $n \geq 0$, the event $(X = m + n)$ is included in $(X > n)$, and then $(X = m + n, X > n) = (X = m + n)$. By using the latter equality, we have

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathbb{P}\left(X = n + m / X_1 > n\right) &= \frac{\mathbb{P}(X = m + n, X > n)}{\mathbb{P}(X > n)} \\
&= \frac{\mathbb{P}(X = m + n)}{\mathbb{P}(X > n)} \\
&= \frac{p(1-p)^{n+m}}{(1-p)^n} \\
&= p(1-p)^m \\
&= \mathbb{P}(X = m)
\end{aligned}$$

We say that X has the property of forgetting the past or loosing the memory. This means the following : if we continuously repeat the Bernoulli experience, then given any time n, the law of the number of failures before the first success after the time n, does not depend on n and still has the probability law (3.7).

(7) Negative Binomial Random variable: $\mathcal{BN}(k, p)$.

A Negative Binomial Random variable Y_k with parameter $k \geq 1$ and $p \in]0, 1[$, denoted by $X \sim \mathcal{BN}(k, p)$, takes its values in

$$\mathcal{V}(X_1) = \{k, k + 1, ...\}$$

and

$$\mathbb{P}(Y_k = n) = p^k (1-p)^n, \ n = 0, 1, ...$$

Generation. Unlikely to the binomial case, we fix the number of successes. And we independently repeat a Bernoulli experience with probability $p \in]0, 1[$ until we reach k successes. The number X of experiences needed to reach k successes is called a Negative Binomial Random variable or parameters p and k.

(1) For Binomial random variable $X \sim \mathcal{B}(n, p)$, we set the number of experiences to n and search the probability that the number of success is equal to k : $\mathbb{P}(X = k)$.

(1) For a Negative Binomial random variable $Y_k \sim \mathcal{NB}(n, p)$, we set the number of successes k and search the probability that the number

of experiences needed to have k successes is equal to n : $\mathbb{P}(Y_k = n)$.

Of course, we need at least k experiences to hope to get k successes. So, the values set of Y_k is

$$\mathcal{V}(X_1) = \{k, k+1, ...\}.$$

The event $(Y_k = n)$ occurs if and only if :

(1) The n^{th} experience is successful.

(2) Among the $(n-1)$ first experiences, we got exactly $(k-1)$ successes.

By independence, the probability of the event $(Y_k = n)$ is the product of the probabilities of the described events in (1) and (2), denoted $a \times b$. But $a = p$ and b is the probability to get $k-1$ successes in $n-1$ independent Bernoulli experiences with parameter p. Then, we have

$$b = \left(\begin{array}{c} n-1 \\ k-1 \end{array} \right) p^{k-1} \ (1-p)^{(n-1)-(k-1)}.$$

By using, the product of probabilities $a \times b$, we arrive at

$$\mathbb{P}(Y_k = n) = \left(\begin{array}{c} n-1 \\ k-1 \end{array} \right) p^k \ (1-p)^{n-k}, \ n \geq k.$$

(8) Poisson Random Variable $\mathcal{P}(\lambda)$.

A Poisson Random Variable with parameter $\lambda > 0$, denoted by $\mathcal{P}(\lambda)$ takes its values in $\mathbb{N}$ and

$$\mathbb{P}(X = k) = \frac{\lambda^k}{k!} e^{-\lambda}, \ k = 0, \ 1, \ 2, ... \tag{3.8}$$

where λ is a positive number.

Here, we are not able to generate the Poisson law by a simple experience. Rather, we are going to show how to derive it by a limit procedure from binomial random variables.

First, we have the show that Formula (3.8) satisfies (2.1). If this is true, we say that Formula (3.8) is the probability law of some random variable taking its values in $\mathbb{N}$.

Remind the the following expansion (from calculus courses)

$$e^x = \sum_{k=0}^{+\infty} \frac{x^k}{k!}, x \in \mathbb{R}. \tag{3.9}$$

By using (3.9), we get

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_{k=0}^{+\infty} \mathbb{P}(X=k) &= \sum_{k=0}^{+\infty} \frac{\lambda^k}{k!} e^{-\lambda} \\ &= e^{-\lambda} \sum_{k=0}^{+\infty} \frac{\lambda^k}{k!} \\ &= e^{-\lambda} e^{+\lambda} = 1 \end{aligned}$$

A random variable whose probability law is given by (3.8) is said to follow a Poisson law with parameter λ.

We are going to see how to derive it from a sequence binonial random variables.

Let X_n, a sequence of $\mathbb{B}(n, p_n)$ random variables such that, as $n \to +\infty$,

$$p_n \to 0 \text{ and } np_n \to \lambda, 0 < \lambda < +\infty. \tag{3.10}$$

THEOREM 3. *Let*

$$f_n(k) = \left(\begin{array}{c} n \\ k \end{array} \right) p^k (1-p)^{n-k}.$$

be the probability law of the random variable X_n and the probability law of the Poisson random variable

$$f(k) = \frac{e^{-\lambda} \lambda^k}{k!}$$

Suppose that (3.10) holds. Then, for any fixed $k \in \mathbb{N}$, we have, as $n \to \infty$,

$$f_n(k) \to f(k).$$

Comments. We say that the probability laws of binomial random random variables X_n with parameters n and p_n converges to the probability law of a Poisson random variable Z with parameter λ, $0 < \lambda < +\infty$, as $n \to +\infty$, when $np_n \to \lambda$.

Proof. Since $np_n \to \lambda$, we may denote $\varepsilon(n) = np_n - \lambda \to 0$. Then $p = (\lambda + \varepsilon(n))/n$.

For k fixed and $n > \ k$, we may write,

$$f_n(k,\ p) =$$

$$= \frac{n!}{k! \times (n-k)! \times n^k}(\lambda + \varepsilon(n))^k(1 - \frac{\lambda}{n} - \frac{\varepsilon(n)}{n})^{n-k}.$$

Hence,

$$f_n(k,\ p) = \frac{\lambda^k}{k!}\frac{(n-k+1) \times (n-k+2) \times ... \times (n-1) \times (n-0)}{n^k}$$

$$\times(1 - \frac{\lambda + \varepsilon(n)}{n})^n \left\{(1 + \varepsilon(n)/\lambda)^k(1 - \frac{\lambda + \varepsilon(n)}{n})^{-k}\right\}$$

$$= \frac{\lambda^k}{k!} \times (1 - \frac{k-1}{n}) \times (1 - \frac{k-2}{n}) \times ... \times (1 - \frac{1}{n}) \times 1$$

$$\times(1 - \frac{\lambda + \varepsilon(n)}{n})^n \left\{(1 + \varepsilon(n)/\lambda)^k(1 - \frac{\lambda + \varepsilon(n)}{n})^{-k}\right\}$$

$$\to \frac{\lambda^k}{k!}e^{-\lambda}$$

since

$$(1 - \frac{k-1}{n}) \times (1 - \frac{k-2}{n}) \times ... \times (1 - \frac{1}{n}) \times 1 \to 1,$$

$$\left\{(1 + \varepsilon(n)/\lambda)^k(1 - \frac{\lambda + \varepsilon(n)}{n})^{-k}\right\} \to 1$$

and

$$(1 - \frac{\lambda + \varepsilon(n)}{n})^n \to e^{-\lambda}.$$

4. Independence of random variables

Definition 3. The discrete random variables X_1, X_2, . . ., X_n are mutually independent if and only if for any subset $\{i_1, i_2, ..., i_k\}$ of $\{1, 2, ..., n\}$ and for any k-tuple $(s_1, ..., s_k)$, we have the factorizing formula

$$\mathbb{P}(X_{i_1} = s_1, ..., X_{i_k} = s_k) = \mathbb{P}(X_{i_1} = s_1)...\mathbb{P}(X_{i_k} = s_k)$$

The random variables X_1, X_2, ... , X_n are pairwise independent if and only if for any $1 \leq i \neq j \leq n$, for any s_i and s_j, we have

$$\mathbb{P}(X_i = s_i \ , \ X_j = s_j) = \mathbb{P}(X_i = s_i) \ \mathbb{P}(X_j = s_j).$$

Example 4. Consider a Bernoulli experience with parameter $p \in]0, 1[$ independently repeated. Set

$$X_i = \begin{cases} 1 \text{ if the i}^{th} \text{ experience is successful} \\ \\ 0 \text{ otherwise} \end{cases}$$

Each X_i follows a Bernoulli law with parameter p, that is $X_i \sim \mathcal{B}(p)$.

The random variables X_i are independent by construction. After n, repetitions, the number of successes X is exactly

$$X = \sum_{i=1}^{n} X_i.$$

We have the following conclusion : A Binomial random variable $X \sim \mathcal{B}(n, p)$ is always the sum of n independent random variables X_1, ..., X_n, following all a Bernoulli law $\mathcal{B}(p)$.

Example 6. Consider a Bernoulli experience with parameter $p \in]0, 1[$ independently repeated.

Let T_1 be the number of experiences needed to get one success.

Let T_2 be the number of experiences needed to get one success after the first success.

Generally, for $i > 1$, let T_i be the number of experiences needed to get one success after the $(i-1)^{th}$ success.

It is clear that

$$T_1 + ... + T_k$$

is the number of experiences needed to have k successes, that is

$$Y_k = T_1 + ... + T_k$$

Because of the Memory loss property, the random variables $T_i - 1$ are independent, so are the T_i. We get a conclusion that is similar to binomial case.

Conclusion : a Negative Binomial random variable $\mathcal{NB}(k, p)$ is a sum of k independent random variables T_1, ...,T_k following all a geometric law $\mathcal{G}(p)$.

Because of the importance of such results, we are going to state them into lemmas.

LEMMA 1. *A Binomial random variable $X \sim \mathcal{B}(n, p)$ is always the sum of n independent random variables X_1, ..., X_n, following all a Bernoulli law $\mathcal{B}(p)$.*

and

LEMMA 2. *A Negative Binomial random variable $\mathcal{NB}(k, p)$ is a sum of k independent random variables T_1, ...,T_k following all a geometric law $\mathcal{G}(p)$.*

CHAPTER 5

Real-valued Random Variable Parameters

Before we begin, wee strongly stress that the mathematical expectation is defined only for a real-valued random variable. If a random variable is not a real-valued one, we may only have mathematical expectation of real-valued functions of it.

1. Mean and Mathematical Expectation

Let us introduce the notion of mathematical expectation in an every day life example.

Example 1. Consider a class of 24 students. Suppose that 5 of them are 19 year old, 7 are 20 , 10 are 23, and 2 are 17. Let us denote by m the mean age of the class, that is :

$$m = \frac{5 \times 19 \ + \ 7 \times 20 \ + \ 10 \times 23 \ + \ 2 \times 7}{24} = 20.79.$$

Let X be the random variable taking the distinct ages as values, that is $\mathcal{V}(X) = \{x_1, ..., x_4\}$ with $x_1 = 19$, $x_2 = 20$, $x_3 = 23$, $x_4 = 17$, with probability law :

$$\mathbb{P}(X = x_1) = \frac{5}{24}, \ \mathbb{P}(X = x_2) = \frac{7}{24}, \ \mathbb{P}(X = x_3) = \frac{10}{24}, \ \mathbb{P}(X = x_4) = \frac{3}{24}.$$

We may summarize this probability law in the following table :

k	19	20	23	17
$P(x = k)$	$\frac{5}{24}$	$\frac{7}{24}$	$\frac{10}{24}$	$\frac{3}{24}$

Set Ω as the class of these 24 students. The following graph

$$\begin{array}{rccc} X: & \Omega & \to & \mathbb{R} \\ & \omega & \hookrightarrow & X(\omega) = \text{ age of the student } \omega. \end{array}$$

defines a random variable. The probability that is used on Ω is the frequency of occurrence. For each $i \in \{1, 2, 3, 4\}$, $\mathbb{P}(X = x_i)$ is the

frequency of occurrence of the age x_i in the class.

Through these notations, we have the following expression of the mean m :

$$m = \sum_{i=1}^{4} x_i \, \mathbb{P}(X = x_i). \tag{1.1}$$

The formula (1.1) is the expression of the mathematical expectation of the random variable X. **Mean values** in real life are particular cases of mathematical expectations in Probability Theory.

2. Definition and examples

Let X be a discrete real-valued random variable taking its values in $\mathcal{V}(X) = \{x_i \; i \in, I\}$, where I is a subset of $\mathbb{N}$. If the quantity

$$\sum_{i \in I} x_i \, \mathbb{P}(X = x_i) \tag{2.1}$$

exists in $\mathbb{R}$, we called it the mathematical expectation of X, denoted by $\mathbb{E}(X)$, and we write

$$\mathbb{E}(X) = \sum_{i \in I} x_i \, \mathbb{P}(X = x_i).$$

If the quantity (2.1) is $-\infty$ or $+\infty$, we still name it the mathematical expectation, with $\mathbb{E}(X) = -\infty$ or $\mathbb{E}(X) = +\infty$.

We are now giving some examples.

Example 2. Let X be a degenerated random variable at c, that is

$$\mathbb{P}(X = c) = 1$$

Then, Formula (2) reduces to :

$$\mathbb{E}(X) = c \times \mathbb{P}(X = c) = c.$$

Let us keep in mind that the mathematical expectation of a constant is itself.

Example 3 Let X be Bernoulli random variable, $X \sim \mathcal{B}(p)$, $p \in]0, 1[$. Formula (2) is

$$\mathbb{E}(X) = 1 \times \mathbb{P}(X = 1) + 0 \times \mathbb{P}(X = 0) = p.$$

Exemple 4. Let X be a Binomial random variable, that is $X \sim \mathcal{B}(n, p)$, $n \geq 1$ and $p \in]0, 1[$. Formula (2) gives

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathbb{E}(X) &= \sum_{k=0}^{n} k\ \mathbb{P}(X = k) = \sum_{k=0}^{n} \frac{k\ n!}{k!(n-k)!} p^k (1-p)^{n-k} \\
&= \sum_{k=1}^{n} np\ \frac{(n-1)!}{(k-1)!(n-k)!\ p^{k-1}(1-p)^{n-k}} \\
&= np\ \sum_{k=1}^{n} C_{n-1}^{k-1}\ p^{k-1}(1-p)^{(n-1)-(k-1)}
\end{aligned}$$

Let us make the change of variable : $k' = k - 1$ and $n' = n - 1$. By the Newton's Formula in Theorem 1 in Chapter 1,

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathbb{E}(X) &= np\ \sum_{k'=0}^{n'} \left(\begin{array}{c} n' \\ k' \end{array} \right)\ p^{k'}(1-p)^{n'-k'} \\
&= np\ \ (p + (1-p))^{n'} = np.
\end{aligned}$$

Exercise 1. Find the mathematical expectation of the a hypergeometric $\mathcal{H}(N, r, \theta)$ random variable, a Negative Binomial $\mathcal{BN}(k, p)$ random variable and a Poisson $\mathcal{P}(\lambda)$ random variable with $N \geq 1$, $0 < r \leq N$, $\theta \in]0, 1[$, $n \geq 1$, $p \in]0, 1[$, $\lambda > 0$.

Answers. We will find respectively : $r\theta$,$(1-\theta)\left(\frac{1-r}{N}\right)$ and λ.

3. General Properties of the Mathematical Expectation

Let X and Y be two discrete random variables with respective set of values $\{x_i,\ i \in I\}$and $\{y_j,\ j \in J\}$. Let g anf h be two functions from $\mathbb{R}$ onto $\mathbb{R}$, k a function from $\mathbb{R}^2$ onto $\mathbb{R}$. Finally, λ and μ are real numbers.

We suppose that all the mathematical expectations used below exist. We have the following properties.

(P1). Mathematical Expectation of a function of the random variable.

$$\mathbb{E}(g(X)) = \sum_{i \in I} g(x_i)\ \mathbb{P}(X = x_i). \tag{3.1}$$

(P2). Mathematical expectation of a real function of a couple of real random variables.

$$\mathbb{E}(k(X,Y)) = \sum_{(i,\ j) \in I \times J} k(x_i,\ y_j)\ \mathbb{P}(X = x_i,\ Y = y_j). \tag{3.2}$$

(P3). Linearity of the mathematical expectation operator.

The mathematical expectation operator : $X \to \mathbb{E}(X)$, is linear, that is

$$\mathbb{E}(\lambda X + \mu Y) = \lambda \mathbb{E}(X) + \mu \mathbb{E}(Y).$$

(P4). Non-negativity of the mathematical expectation operator.

(i) The mathematical expectation operator is non-negative, that is

$$X \geq 0 \Rightarrow \mathbb{E}(X) \geq 0.$$

(ii) If X is non-negative random variable, then

$$(\mathbb{E}(X) = 0) \Leftrightarrow (X = 0).$$

Rule. A positive random variable has a positive mathematical expectation. A non-negative random variable is constant to zero if its mathematical expectation is zero.

(P5) The mathematical expectation operator is non-decreasing, that is

$$X \leq Y \Rightarrow \mathbb{E}(\mathbb{X}) \leq \mathbb{E}(\mathbb{Y}).$$

(P6) Factorization Formula of the mathematical expectation of a product of real functions of two independent random variables : the random variables X and Y are independent if and only if for any real function

g of X and h of Y such that the mathematical expectations of X and of Y exist, we have

$$\mathbb{E}(g(X) \times h(Y)) = \mathbb{E}(g(X)) \times \ \mathbb{E}(h(Y))$$

Remarks : In Formulas (P1), (P2) and (P6), the random variables X and Y are not necessarily real-valued random variables. They may be of any kind : vectors, categorical objects, etc.
Proofs.

Proof of (P1). Set $Z = g(X),\ X \in \{x_i,\ i \in I\}$. The values set of Z are the distinct values of $g(x_i)$, $i \in I$. Let us denote the values set by $\{z_k,\ k \in K\}$, where necessarily, $Card(K) \leq Card(I)$, since

$$\{z_k,\ k \in K\} \subseteq \{g(x_i),\ i \in I\}\,.$$

For each $k \in K$, we are going to define the class of all x_i such that $g(x_i) = z_k$, that is

$$I_k = \{i \in I\ ,\ g(x_i) = z_k\}\,.$$

It comes that for $k \in K$,

$$(Z = z_k) = \underset{i \in I_k}{\cup} (X = x_i).$$

It is also obvious that the $I_k, k \in K$, form a partition of I, that is

$$I = \sum_{k \in K} I_k. \tag{3.3}$$

Formula (3) implies that

$$\mathbb{P}(Z = z_k) = \sum_{i \in I_k} \mathbb{P}(X = x_i). \tag{3.4}$$

By definition, we have

$$\mathbb{E}(Z) = \sum_{k \in K}\ z_k\ \mathbb{P}(Z = z_k). \tag{3.5}$$

Let us combine all these facts to conclude. By the partition (3.3), we have

$$\sum_{i \in I}\ g(x_i)\ \mathbb{P}(X = x_i) = \sum_{k \in K} \sum_{i \in I_k}\ g(x_i)\ \mathbb{P}(X = x_i).$$

Now, we use the remark that $g(x_i) = z_k$ on I_k, in the latter expression, to get

$$\begin{aligned}\sum_{k\in K}\sum_{i\in I_k} g(z_k)\ \mathbb{P}(X = x_i) &= \sum_{k\in K} g(z_k)\Big(\sum_{i\in I_k} \mathbb{P}(X = x_i)\Big)\\ &= \sum_{k\in K} g(z_k)\mathbb{P}(Z = z_k)\end{aligned}$$

where we used (3.4) in the last line, which is (3.5). The proof is finished.

Proof of (P2). This proof of the property is very similar to that of (P1). Set $V = k(X,\ Y),\ X \in \{x_i,\ i \in I\}$ and $Y \in \{y_j,\ j \in J\}$. As in the proof of (P1), V take the distinct values among the values $k(x_i, y_j)$, $(i, j) \in I \times J$, and we write

$$\mathcal{V}_V = \{v_k,\ k \in K\} \subseteq \{k(x_{i,}\ y_j),\ (i,\ j) \in I \times J\}\,.$$

Similarly, we partition $\mathcal{V}_V$ in the following way :

$$I_k = \{(i,\ j) \in I \times J, k(x_i,\ y_j) = v_k\}\,.$$

so that

$$I \times J = \sum_{k\in K} I_k. \tag{3.6}$$

and

$$(V = v_k) = \underset{(i,j)\in I_k}{\cup} (X = x_i, Y = y_j).$$

Formula (3.4) implies

$$\mathbb{P}(V = v_k) = \sum_{(i,j)\in I_k} \mathbb{P}(X = x_i, Y = y_j). \tag{3.7}$$

By definition, we have

$$\mathbb{E}(V) = \sum_{k\in K} v_k\ \mathbb{P}(V = v_k). \tag{3.8}$$

Next, by the partition (3.6), we have

$$\begin{aligned} & \sum_{(i,j)\in I\times J} k(x_i,y_j)\ \mathbb{P}(X=x_i,Y)y_j) \\ = & \sum_{k\in K}\sum_{i\in I_k} g(v_k)\ \mathbb{P}(X=x_i) \end{aligned}$$

Now, we use the remark that that $k(x_i, y_j) = v_k$ on I_k, in the latter expression, to get

$$\begin{aligned} & \sum_{(i,j)\in I\times J} k(x_i,y_j)\ \mathbb{P}(X=x_i,Y=y_j) \\ = & \sum_{k\in K}\sum_{i\in I_k} g(v_k)\ \mathbb{P}(X=x_i,Y=y_j) \\ = & \sum_{k\in K} g(v_k)\bigg(\sum_{i\in I_k}\mathbb{P}(X=x_i,Y=y_j)\bigg) \\ = & \sum_{k\in K} g(v_k)\mathbb{P}(V=v_k) \end{aligned}$$

where we used (3.7) in the last line, which is (3.8). The proof is finished.

Proof of (P3). First, let us apply (P1) with $g(X) = \lambda X$, to get

$$\mathbb{E}(\lambda X) = \sum_{i\in I} \lambda\ x_i\ \mathbb{P}(X=x_i) = \lambda\ \mathbb{E}(X).$$

Next, we apply (P2) with $k(x,\ y) = x + y$, to get

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E}(X+Y) &= \sum_{(i,\ j)\in I\times J} (x_i+y_j)\ \mathbb{P}(X=x_i,\ Y=y_j) \\ &= \sum_{i\in I} x_i\left\{\sum_{j\in J}\mathbb{P}(X=x_i,\ Y=y_j)\right\} + \sum_{j\in J} y_j\left\{\sum_{i\in I}\mathbb{P}(X=x_i,\ Y=y_j)\right\}. \end{aligned}$$

But

$$\Omega = \underset{j\in J}{\cup}(Y=y_j) = \sum_{j\in J}(Y=y_j).$$

Thus,

$$(X=x_i) = (X=x_i)\cap\Omega = \sum_{j\in J}(X=x_i,\ Y=y_j),$$

and then

$$\mathbb{P}(X = x_i) = \sum_{j \in J} \mathbb{P}(X = x_i,\ Y = y_j).$$

By the symmetry of the roles of X and Y, we also have

$$\mathbb{P}(Y = y_j) = \sum_{i \in I} \mathbb{P}(X = x_i,\ Y = y_j).$$

Finally,

$$E(X) = \sum_{i \in I} x_i\ \mathbb{P}(X = x_i) + \sum_{j \in J} y_j\ \mathbb{P}(Y = y_j) = E(X) + E(Y).$$

We just finished the proof that the mathematical expectation is linear. linéaire.

Proof of (P4).

Part (i).

Let $X \in \{x_i,\ i \in I\}$ and $X \geq 0$. This means that the values of X, which are the x_i's, are non-negative. Hence, we have

$$\mathbb{E}(X) = \sum_{i \in I} x_i\ \mathbb{P}(X = x_i) \geq 0,$$

as a sum of the product of x_i and $\mathbb{P}(X = x_i)$ both non-negative.

Part (ii).

Assume that X is non-negative. This means that the values x_i are non-negative. $\mathbb{E}(X) = 0$ means that

$$\mathbb{E}(X) = \sum_{i \in I} x_i\ \mathbb{P}(X = x_i) = 0.$$

Since the left-hand member of this equation is formed by a sum of non-negative terms, it is null if and only if each of the terms are null, that is for each $i \in I$,

$$x_i\ \mathbb{P}(X = x_i) = 0.$$

Hence, if x_i is a value if X, we have $\mathbb{P}(X = x_i) > 0$, and then x_i. This means that X only takes the value 0. Thus, we have $X = 0$.

Proof of (P5). Let $X \leq Y$. By linearity and, since the mathematical expectation is a non-negative operator,

$$0 \leq \mathbb{E}(Y - X) = \mathbb{E}(Y) - \mathbb{E}(X).$$

Hence $\mathbb{E}(Y) \geq \mathbb{E}(X)$.

Proof of (P6). Suppose that X and Y are independent. Set $k(x, y) = g(x)h(y)$. We may apply (P2) to get

$$\mathbb{E}(g(X)h(Y)) = \sum_{i,\ j} g(x_i)h(y_j)\ \mathbb{P}(X = x_i,\ Y = y_j).$$

But, by independence,

$$\mathbb{P}(X = x_i,\ Y = y_j) = \mathbb{P}(X = x_i)\ \mathbb{P}(Y = y_j),$$

for all $(i, j) \in I \times J$. Then, we have

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathbb{E}(g(X)h(Y)) &= \sum_{j\in J}\sum_{i\in I} g(x_i)\ \mathbb{P}(X = x_i)\ h(y_j)\ \mathbb{P}(Y = y_j) \\
&= \sum_{i\in I} g(x_i)\ \mathbb{P}(X = x_i) \times \sum_{j\in J} h(y_j)\ \mathbb{P}(y = y_j) \\
&= \mathbb{E}(g(X))\ \mathbb{E}(h(Y)).
\end{aligned}$$

This proves the direct implication.

Now, suppose that

$$\mathbb{E}(g(X)h(Y)) = \mathbb{E}(g(X)) \times\ \mathbb{E}(h(Y)),$$

for all functions g and h for which the mathematical expectations make senses. Consider two particular values in $I \times J$, $i_0 \in I$ and $j_0 \in J$. Set

$$g(x) = \begin{cases} 0 \text{ si } x \neq x_{i_0} \\ 1 \text{ si } x = x_{i_0} \end{cases}$$

and

$$h(y) = \begin{cases} 0 \text{ if } y \neq y_{j_0} \\ 1 \text{ if } y = y_{j_0} \end{cases}$$

We have

$$\begin{aligned}\mathbb{E}(g(X)h(Y)) &= \sum_{(i,\ j)\in I\times J} g(x_i)h(y_j)\ \mathbb{P}(X=x_i,\ Y=y_j)\\ &= \mathbb{P}(X=x_{i_0},\ Y=y_{j_0})\\ &= \mathbb{E}g(X)\times\mathbb{E}h(Y)\\ &= \sum_{i\in I} g(x_i)\ \mathbb{P}(X=x_i)\ \times\sum_{j\in J} h(y_j)\mathbb{P}(Y=y_j)\\ &= \mathbb{P}(X=x_{i_0})\ \mathbb{P}(Y=y_{j_0}).\end{aligned}$$

We proved that for any $(i_0, j_0) \in I \times J$, we have

$$\mathbb{P}(X=x_{i_0},\ Y=y_{j_0}) = \mathbb{P}(X=x_{i_0})\ \mathbb{P}(Y=y_{i_0})$$

We then have the independence.

4. Usual Parameters of Real-valued Random Variables

Let X and Y be a discrete real-valued random variables with respective values set $\{x_i,\ i\in I\}$ and $\{y_j,\ j\in J\}$.

The most common parameters of such random variables are defined below.

4.1. Definitions. . We list below the names of some parameters and next give their expressions.

k^{th} non centered moments or moments of order $k \geq 1$:

$$m_k = \mathbb{E}(X^k) = \sum_{i\in I} x_i^k\ \mathbb{P}(X=x_i)$$

Centered Moments of order $k \geq 1$:

$$M_k = \mathbb{E}((X-\mathbb{E}(X))^k) = \sum_{i\in I}(x_i-\mathbb{E}(X))^k\ \mathbb{P}(X=x_i)$$

Variance and Standard deviation.

The variance of X is defined by :

$$\sigma_X^2 = Var(X) = \mathbb{E}((X-\mathbb{E}(X))^2) = \sum_{i\in I}(x_i-\mathbb{E}(X))^k\ \mathbb{P}(X=x_i)$$

The square root of the variance of X, $\sigma_X = (Var(X))^{\frac{1}{2}}$, is the standard deviation of X.

Remark. The variance is the centered moment of order 2.

factorial moment of order two of X :

$$fm_2(X) = \mathbb{E}((X(X-1)) = \sum_{i \in I} x_i \ (x_i - 1) \ \mathbb{P}(X = x_i).$$

Covariance between X and Y :

$$Cov(X,Y) = \mathbb{E}((X - \mathbb{E}(X))(\mathbb{E} - \mathbb{E}(Y))) = \sum_{i,\ j} (x_i - \mathbb{E}(X))(y_i - \mathbb{E}(Y)) \ \mathbb{P}(X = x_i,\ Y = y_j).$$

Linear correlation coefficient between X and Y.

If $\sigma_X \neq 0$ and $\sigma_Y \neq 0$, we may define the number

$$\sigma_{XY} = \frac{Cov(X,Y)}{\sigma_X \ \sigma_Y}$$

as the linear correlation coefficient.

Now, we are going to review important properties of these properties.

4.2. Properties.

(1) Other expression of the variance and the covariance.

(i) The variance and the covariance have the following two alternative expressions :

$$Var(X) = \mathbb{E}(X^2) - \mathbb{E}(X)^2.$$

and

$$Cov(X,Y) = \mathbb{E}(XY) - \mathbb{E}(X) \ \mathbb{E}(Y).$$

Rule. The variance is the difference of the non centered moment of order two *and* the square of the mathematical expectation.

Rule. The covariance between X and Y is the difference of mathematical expectation of the product of X and Y *and* the product of the

mathematical expectations of X and Y.

(ii) The variance can be computed form the factorial moment of order 2 by

$$Var(X) = fm_2(X) + \mathbb{E}(X)^2 - \mathbb{E}(X)^2. \tag{4.1}$$

Remark. In a number of cases, the computation of the second factorial moment is easier than that of the second moment, and Formula (4.1) becomes handy.

(2). The standard deviation or the variance is zero if and only if the random variable is constant and is equal to its mathematical expectation :

$$\sigma_X = 0 \text{ if and only if } X = \mathbb{E}(X)$$

(3) Variance of a linear combination of random variables.

(i) Variance of the sum of two random variables :

$$Var(X + Y) = Var(X) + Var(Y) + 2Cov(X, Y).$$

(ii) Independence and Covariance. If X and Y are independent then

$$Var(X + Y) = Var(X) + Var(Y) \text{ and } Cov(X, Y) = 0.$$

We conclude by :

(3ii-a) The variance of independent random variable is the sum of the variance.

(3ii-b) If X and y are independent, they are uncorrelated that is,

$$Cov(X, Y) = 0.$$

Two random variables X and y are linearly uncorrelated if and only $Cov(X, Y)$. This is implied by the independence. But lack of correlation does not imply independence. This may happen for special class

of random variables, like Gaussian ones.

(iii) Variance of linear combination of random variables.

Let X_i, $i \geq 1$, be a sequence of real-valued random variables. Let a_i, $i \geq 1$, be a sequence of real numbers. The variance of the linear combination

$$\sum_{i=1}^{k} a_i X_i$$

is given by :

$$Var(\sum_{i=1}^{k} a_i X_i) = \sum_{i=1}^{k} a_i^2 \; Var(X_i) + 2 \sum_{1 \leq i < j \leq k} a_i a_j \; Cov(X_i, X_j).$$

(4). Cauchy-Schwartzs inequality :

$$|Cov(X, Y)| \leq \sigma_X \; \sigma_Y.$$

(5). Hölder Inequality.

Let $p > 1$ and $q > 1$ such that $1/p + 1/q = 1$. Suppose that

$$\|X\|_p = \mathbb{E}(|X|^p)^{1/p}$$

and

$$\|X\|_q = \mathbb{E}(|X|^q)^{1/q}$$

exists. Then

$$|\mathbb{E}(XY)| \leq \|X\|_p \times \|X\|_p$$

(6) Minkowski's Inequality.

For any $p > 1$,

$$\|X + Y\|_p \leq \|X\|_p + \|Y\|_p$$

The number $\|X\|_p$ is called the L_p-norm of X.

(7) Jensen's Inequality.

if $g : I \mapsto \mathbb{R}$ is a convex convex on an interval including $\mathcal{V}_X$, and if

$$\mathbb{E}(|X|) = \sum_{i \in I} p_i |x_i| < +\infty$$

and

$$\mathbb{E}(|g(X)|) = \sum_{i \in I} p_i |g(x_i)| < +\infty,$$

then

$$g(\mathbb{E}(X)) \leq \mathbb{E}(g(X)).$$

Proofs. Let us provide the proofs of these properties one by one in the same order in which they are stated.

Proof of (1).

Part **(i)**. Let us apply the linearity of the mathematical expectation stated in Property (P3) above to the following development

$$(X - E(X))^2 = X^2 + 2XE(X) + E(X)^2$$

to get :

$$\begin{aligned} Var(X) = \mathbb{E}(X - E(X))^2 &= \mathbb{E}(X^2 - 2\ X\ \mathbb{E}(X) + \mathbb{E}(X)^2) \\ &= \mathbb{E}(X^2) - 2\mathbb{E}(X)\mathbb{E}(X) + \mathbb{E}(X)^2 \\ &= \mathbb{E}(X^2) - \mathbb{E}(X)^2. \end{aligned}$$

We also have, by the same technique,

$$\begin{aligned} Cov(X, Y) &= \mathbb{E}(X - \mathbb{E}(X))(Y - \mathbb{E}(Y)) \\ &= \mathbb{E}(XY - X\mathbb{E}(Y) - Y\mathbb{E}(X) + \mathbb{E}(X)\ \mathbb{E}(Y)) \\ &= \mathbb{E}(XY) - \mathbb{E}(X)\ \mathbb{E}(Y) \end{aligned} \tag{4.2}$$

Let us notice that the following identity

$$Var(X) = Cov(X, X)$$

and next remark that the second formula implies the first.

From the formula of the covariance, we see by applying Property (P6), that the independence of X and Y implies

$$\mathbb{E}(XY) = \mathbb{E}(X) \times \mathbb{E}(Y)$$

and then

$$cov(X, Y) = 0$$

Part **(ii)**. It is enough to remark that

$$fm_2(X) = \mathbb{E}(X(X-1)) = \mathbb{E}(X^2) - \mathbb{E}(X),$$

and to use it the Formula of the variance above.

Proof of (2). Let us begin to prove the direct implication. Assume $\sigma_X = 0$. Then

$$\sigma_X^2 = \sum_i (x_i - \mathbb{E}(X))^2 \ \mathbb{P}(X = x_i) = 0.$$

Since this sum of non-negative terms is null, each of the terms are null, that is for each $i \in I$,

$$(x_i - E(X))^2 \ \mathbb{P}(X = x_i) = 0.$$

Hence, if x_i is a value if X, we have $\mathbb{P}(X = x_i) > 0$, and then $x_i - E(X) = 0$, that is $x_i = \mathbb{E}(X)$. This means that X only takes the value $\mathbb{E}(X)$.

Conversely, if X takes one unique value c, we have $\mathbb{P}(X = c) = 1$. Then for any $k \geq 1$,

$$\mathbb{E}(X^k) = c^k \ \mathbb{P}(X = c) = c^k.$$

Finally, the variance is

$$Var(X) = \mathbb{E}(X^2) - \mathbb{E}(X)^2 = c^2 - c^2 = 0.$$

Proof of (3). We begin by the general case of a linear combination of random variables of the form $Y = \sum_{i=1}^{k} a_i X_i$. By the linearity Property (P6) of the mathematical expectation, we have

$$\mathbb{E}(\mathbb{Y}) = \sum_{i=1}^{k} a_i \mathbb{E}(X_i).$$

It comes

$$Y - \mathbb{E}(\mathbb{Y}) = \sum_{i=1}^{k} a_i(X_i - \mathbb{E}(X_i)).$$

Now, we use the full development of products of two sums

$$(Y-\mathbb{E}(Y))^2 = \sum_{i=1}^{k} a_i^2(X_i-E(X_i))^2+2\sum_{1\leq i<j\leq k} a_i a_j\ (X_i-\mathbb{E}(X_i))(X_j-\mathbb{E}(X_j)).$$

We apply the mathematical expectation of the this formula to get

$$Var(Y) = \sum_{i=1}^{k} a_i^2\ Var(X_i) + 2\sum_{1\leq i<j\leq k} a_i a_j\ Cov(X_i, X_j).$$

In particular If X_1,...,X_k are pairwise independent (let alone mutually independent), then

$$Var(Y) = \sum_{i=1}^{k} a_i^2 Var(X_i)$$

Proof of (4). We are going to proof the Cauchy-Schwartzs inequality by studying the sign of the trinomial function $VarX + \lambda^2 Var(Y) + 2\lambda Cov(X, Y)$, where $\lambda \in \mathbb{R}$.

We begin to remark that if $Var(Y) = 0$, then by Point (2) above, Y is a constant, say $c = \mathbb{E}(Y)$. Since $Y - \mathbb{E}(Y) = c - c$, this implies that

$$cov(X, c) = \mathbb{E}(X - \mathbb{E}(X))(Y - \mathbb{E}(Y))) = \mathbb{E}(X - \mathbb{E}(X))(0) = 0.$$

In that case, the inequality

$$|cov(X, Y)| \leq \sigma_X \sigma_X,$$

is true, since the two members are both zero.

Now suppose that $Var(Y) > 0$. By using Point (3) above, we have

$$Var(X + \lambda\ Y) = VarX + \lambda^2 Var(Y) + 2\lambda Cov(X, Y).$$

Then we get that the trinomial function $VarX+\lambda^2 Var(Y)+2\lambda Cov(X, Y)$ in λ has the constant non-negative sign. This is possible if and only if the discriminant is non-positive, that is

$$\Delta' = Cov(X, Y)^2 - VarX \times VarY \leq 0.$$

This leads to

$$Cov(X,Y)^2 \leq VarX \times VarY.$$

By taking the square roots, we get

$$|cov(X,Y)| \leq \sigma_X \sigma_X,$$

which is the searched result.

Proof of (5). We are going to use the following inequality if $\mathbb{R}$:

$$|ab| \leq \frac{|a|^p}{p} + \frac{|b|^q}{q}. \tag{4.3}$$

We may easily check if p and q are positive integers such that $1/p + 1/q = 1$, the both of p and q are greater that the unity and the formulas

$$p = \frac{q}{q-1} \text{ and } \ q = \frac{p}{p-1}.$$

also hold. Assume first that we have : $\|X\|_p \neq 0$ and $\|Y\|_q \neq 0$. Set

$$a = \frac{X}{\|X\|_p} \quad \text{and} \quad b = \frac{Y}{\|Y\|_q}.$$

By using Inequality (4.3), we have

$$\frac{|X \times Y|}{\|X\|_p \times \|Y\|_q} \leq \frac{|X|^p}{p \times \|X\|_p^p} + \frac{|Y|^q}{q \times \|Y\|_q^q}.$$

By taking the mathematical expectation, we obtain

$$\frac{\mathbb{E}\,|X \times Y|}{\|X\|_p \times \|Y\|_q} \leq \frac{\mathbb{E}\,|X|^p}{p \times \|X\|_p^p} + \frac{\mathbb{E}\,|Y|^q}{q \times \|Y\|_q^q}.$$

This yields

$$\frac{\mathbb{E}\,|X \times Y|}{\|X\|_p \times \|Y\|_q} \leq \frac{1}{p} + \frac{1}{q} = 1.$$

We proved the inequality if neither of $\|X\|_p$ and $\|Y\|_q$ are null. If one of them is zero, say $\|X\|_p$, this mean that

$$\mathbb{E}(|X|^p) = 0.$$

By Property Point (ii) of Property (p4) above, $|X|^p = 0$ and hence $X = 0$.

In this case, both members in the Hölder inequality are zero and then, it holds.

Proof of (6). We are going to use the Hölder inequality to establish the Minkowski's one.

First, if $\|X + Y\|_p = 0$, there is nothing to prove. Now, suppose that $\|X + Y\|_p > 0$.

We have

$$|X + Y|^p = |X + Y|^{p-1} |X + Y| \leq |X + Y|^{p-1} |X| + |X + Y|^{p-1} |Y|$$

By taking the expectations, and by using the Hölder to each of the two terms the right-hand member of the inequality and by reminding that $q = (p - 1)/p$, we get

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E}\,|X + Y|^p &\leq \mathbb{E}\,|X + Y|^{p-1} |X| + \mathbb{E}\,|X + Y|^{p-1} |Y| \\ &\leq (\mathbb{E}\,|X|^p)^{1/p} \times \mathbb{E}\,(|X + Y|^{q(p-1)})^{1/q} + (\mathbb{E}\,|Y|^p)^{1/p} \times (\mathbb{E}\,|X + Y|^{q(p-1)})^{1/q}. \end{aligned}$$

Now, we divide the last formula by

$$(\mathbb{E}\,|X + Y|^{q(p-1)})^{1/q} = (\mathbb{E}\,|X + Y|^p)^{1/q},$$

which is not null, to get

$$(\mathbb{E}\,|X + Y|^p)^{1-1/q} \leq \|X\|_p + \|Y\|_p .$$

This was the target.

Proof of (7). Let $g : I \to \mathbb{R}$ be a convex function such that I includes $\mathcal{V}_X$. We will see two particular cases and a general case.

Case 1 : $\mathcal{V}_X$ is finite. In that case, let us denote $\mathcal{V}_X = x_1, \cdots, x_k$, $k \geq 1$. If g is convex, then by Formula (2.2) in Section 2 in the Appendix Chapter 8, Part (D-D1), we have

$$g(p_1 x_1 + ... + p_k x_k) \leq p_k g(x_1) + ... + p_k g(x_k) \tag{4.4}$$

By the property (P1) of the mathematical expectation above, the left-hand member of this inequality is $g(\mathbb{E}(X))$ and the right-hand member

is $\mathbb{E}(g(X))$.

Case 2 : $\mathcal{V}_X$ is countable infinite, g is a bounded function or I is a bounded and closed interval. In that case, let us denote $\mathcal{V}_X = \{x_i, i \geq 1\}$. If g is convex, then by Formula (2.3) Section 2 in the Appendix Chapter 8 , Part (D-D2), we have

$$g(p_1x_1 + ... + p_kx_k) \leq p_kg(x_1) + ... + p_kg(x_k) \tag{4.5}$$

By the property (P1) of the mathematical expectation above, the left-hand member of this inequality is $g(\mathbb{E}(X))$ and the right-hand member is $\mathbb{E}(g(X))$.

Case 3 : Let us suppose that $\mathcal{V}_X$ is countable infinite only. Denote $\mathcal{V}_X = \{x_i, i \geq 1\}$. Here, g is defined on the whole real line $\mathbb{R}$. Let $J_n = [-n, n]$, $n \geq 1$. Put, for $n \geq 1$,

$$I_n = \{i, x_i \in J_n\},$$

$$\mathcal{V}_n = \{x_i, i \in I_n\}$$

and

$$p(n) = \sum_{i \in I_n} p_i.$$

Let X_n be a random variable taking the values of $\mathcal{V}_n = \{x_i, i \in I_n\}$ with the probabilities

$$p_{i,n} = p_i/p(n).$$

By applying the Case 1, we have $g(\mathbb{E}(X_n)) \leq \mathbb{E}g(X_n)$, which is

$$g(\sum_{i \in I_n} p_{i,n}x_i) \leq \sum_{i \in I_n} p_{i,n}g(x_i). \tag{4.6}$$

Here we apply the dominated convergence theory of the Section 3 in the Appendix Section 8. We have

$$\left|\sum_{i \geq 1} p_i x_i 1_{(x_i \in J_n)}\right| \leq \sum_{i \geq 1} p_i |x_i| < +\infty$$

and each $p_i x_i 1_{(x_i \in J_n)}$ converges to $p_i x_i$ as $n \to +\infty$. Then, by the dominated convergence theorem for series, we have

$$\sum_{i \geq 1} p_i x_i 1_{(x_i \in J_n)} \to \sum_{i \geq 0} p_i x_i. \tag{4.7}$$

The same argument based on the finiteness of $\sum_{i\geq 0} p_i|x_i|$ implies that

$$\sum_{i\geq 1} p_i g(x_i) 1_{(x_i\in J_n)} \to \sum_{i\geq 0} p_i g(x_i). \tag{4.8}$$

We referring to Section 2 in the Appendix Chapter 8, Part B, we know that a convex function g is continuous. We may also remark that $p(n)$ converges to the unity as $n \to +\infty$. By combinig these facts with 4.2, we have

$$\sum_{i\geq 1} p_i x_i 1_{(x_i\in J_n)} + (1-p(n) p_i x_i 1_{(x_i\in J_n} \to \sum_{i\geq 0} p_i x_i. \tag{4.9}$$

and

$$g(\sum_{i\geq 1} p_i x_i) = \lim_{n\to+\infty} g(\sum_{i\geq 1} p_i x_i 1_{(x_i\in J_n} + (1-p(n)) \sum_{i\geq 1} p_i x_i 1_{(x_i\in J_n)}$$

which is

$$g(\sum_{i\geq 1} p_i x_i) = \lim_{n\to+\infty} g(p(n) \sum_{i\geq 1} p_{i,n} x_i 1_{(x_i\in J_n} + (1-p(n)) \sum_{i\geq 1} p_i x_i 1_{(x_i\in J_n)}$$

By convexity of g, we have

$$g(\sum_{i\geq 1} p_i x_i) = \lim_{n\to+\infty} p(n) g\left(\sum_{i\geq 1} p_{i,n} x_i 1_{(x_i\in J_n)}\right) + (1-p(n)) g\left(\sum_{i\geq 1} p_i x_i 1_{(x_i\in J_n)}\right)$$

We may write it as

$$g(\sum_{i\geq 1} p_i x_i) = \lim_{n\to+\infty} p(n) g\left(\sum_{i\in I_n} p_{i,n} x_i\right) + (1-p(n)) g\left(\sum_{i\in I_n} p_i x_i\right)$$

By using Formula in the first term of the left-hand member of the latter inequality, we have

$$g(\sum_{i\geq 1} p_i x_i) = \lim_{n\to+\infty} p(n) \sum_{i\in I_n} p_{i,n} g(x_i) + (1-p(n)) g\left(\sum_{i\in I_n} p_i x_i 1_{(x_i\in J_n)}\right).$$

This gives

$$g(\sum_{i\geq 1} p_i x_i) = \lim_{n\to+\infty} \sum_{i\in I_n} p_i g(x_i) + (1-p(n)) g\left(\sum_{i\in I_n} p_i x_i 1_{(x_i\in J_n)}\right).$$

Finally, we have

$$g(\sum_{i\geq 1} p_i x_i) \leq \sum_{i\geq 0} p_i g(x_i) + 0 \times g\left(\sum_{i\geq 0} p_i x_i\right).$$

which is exactly

$$g(\mathbb{E}(X)) \leq \mathbb{E}(g(X)).$$

5. Parameters of Usual Probability law

We are going to find the most common parameters of usual real-valued random variables. It is recommended to know these results by heart.

In each example, we will apply Formula (3.1) and (3.2) to perform the computations.

(a) Bernoulli Random variable : $X \sim \mathcal{B}(p)$.

We have

$$E(X) = 1\ \mathbb{P}(X = 1) + 0\ \mathbb{P}(X = 0) = p$$

$$\mathbb{E}(X^2) = 1^2\mathbb{P}(X = 1) + 0\mathbb{P}(X = 0) = p^2.$$

We conclude :

$$Var(X) = p(1 - p) = pq.$$

(b) Binomial Random variable $Y_n \sim \mathcal{B}(n, p)$.

We have, by Lemma 1 of Chapter 4,

$$Y_n = \sum_{i=1}^{n} X_i$$

where $X_1, ..., X_n$ are Bernoulli $\mathcal{B}$(p) random variables. We are going to use the known parameters of the Bernoulli random variables. By linearity property (P3), its comes that

$$\mathbb{E}(Y_n) = \sum_{i=1}^{n} \mathbb{E}(X_i) = np$$

and by variance-covariance properties in **Point (3)** above, the independence of the X_i's allows to conclude that

$$Var(Y_n) = \sum_{i=1}^{n} Var(X_i) = npq.$$

(c) Geometric Random Variable : $X \sim \mathcal{G}(p)$**,** $p \in]0, 1[$.

Remind that

$$\mathbb{P}(X = k) = p(1-p)^{k-1}, k = 1, 2....$$

Hence

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathbb{E}(X) &= \sum_{k=1}^{\infty} k\ p(1-p)^{k-1} \\
&= p\left(\sum_{k=1}^{\infty} kq^{k-1}\right) \\
&= p\left(\sum_{k=0}^{\infty} q^k\right)' \text{ (use the primitive here)} \\
&= p\left(\frac{1}{1-q}\right)' = \frac{p}{(1-q)^2} \\
&= \frac{p}{p^2} = \frac{1}{p}.
\end{aligned}$$

Its factorial moment of second order is

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathbb{E}(X(X-1)) &= p\sum_{k=1}^{\infty} k(k-1)q^{k-1} = pq\sum_{k=2}^{\infty} k(k-1)q^{k-2} \\
&= pq\left(\sum_{k=0}^{\infty} q^k\right)'' \text{ (Use the primitive twice)} \\
&= pq\left(\frac{1}{(1-q)^2}\right)' \\
&= 2pq(1-q)^{-3} = \frac{2pq}{p^3} = \frac{2q}{p^2}.
\end{aligned}$$

Thus, we get

$$\mathbb{E}(X^2) = \mathbb{E}(X(X-1)) + \mathbb{E}(X) = \frac{2q}{p2} + \frac{1}{p},$$

and finally arrive at

$$Var(X) = \frac{2q}{p^2} + \frac{1}{p} - \frac{1}{p^2} = \frac{q}{p^2}. \tag{5.1}$$

In summary :

$$\mathbb{E}(X) = \frac{1}{p}$$

and

$$Var(X) = \frac{q}{p^2}. \tag{5.2}$$

(d) Negative Binomial Random Variable : $Y_k \sim \mathcal{NB}(k, p)$.

By Lemma 2 of Chapter 4, Y_k is the sum of k independent geometric $\mathcal{G}(p)$ random variables. Like in the Binomial case, we apply the linearity property (P6) and the properties of the variance-covariance in Point (3) above to get

$$\mathbb{E}(X) = \frac{k}{p}.$$

and

$$Var(X) = \frac{kq}{p^2}.$$

(e) Hypergeometric Random Variable

$$Y_r \sim H(N, r, \theta), \quad M = N\theta, \quad r \leq min(r, M).$$

We remind that that

$$\mathbb{P}(X = k) = \frac{\left(\begin{array}{c} N\theta \\ k \end{array} \right) \times \left(\begin{array}{c} N - M \\ r - k \end{array} \right)}{\left(\begin{array}{c} N \\ r \end{array} \right)}.$$

To make the computation simple, we assume that $r < M$. We have

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathbb{E}(Y_r) &= \sum_{k=0}^{r} k \, \frac{M! \quad (N-M)! \qquad r!(N-M)!}{k!(M-k)!(r-k)!(N-M-(r-k))! \quad N!} \\
&= \sum_{k=1}^{r} \frac{rM \quad (M-1)! \quad [(N-1)-(M-1)]!}{N \quad (k-1)! \quad [(M-1)-(k-1)]! \quad [(r-1)-(k-1)]! \quad !(N-1)!} \\
&\times \frac{(r-1)! \quad [(N-1)-(M-1)]!}{\{[(N-1)-(M-1)]-[(r-1)-(k-1)]\}!}
\end{aligned}$$

Let us make the following changes of variables $k' = k-1$, $M' = M-1$, $r' = r-1$, $N' = N-1$. We get

$$\mathbb{E}(Y_r) = \frac{rM}{N}\left[\sum_{k'=0}^{r'} \frac{C_{M'}^{k'} C_{N'-M'}^{r'-k'}}{C_{N'}^{r'}}\right] = \frac{rM}{N} = r\theta,$$

since, the term in the bracket is the sum of probabilities of a Hypergeormetric random variable $\mathcal{H}(N-1, r-1, \theta')$, with $\theta' = (M-1)/(N-1)$, then it is equal to one.

The factorial moment of second order is

$$\mathbb{E}(Y_n(Y_n-1)) = \sum_{k=2}^{n} k(k-1)\ \frac{M!}{k!}\ \frac{(N-M)!}{(M-k)!}\ \frac{n!(N-n)!}{(N-M-(n-k))!}\ \frac{}{(n-k)!}\ \frac{}{N!}.$$

Then we wake the changes of variables $k'' = k-2$, $M'' = M-2$, $N'' = N-2$, $r'' = r-2$, to get

$$\mathbb{E}(Y_r(Y_r-1)) = \frac{Mr(M-1)(r-1)}{N(N-1)}\left[\sum_{k''=0}^{r''} \frac{C_{M''}^{k''} C_{N''-M''}^{r''-k''}}{C_{N''}^{r''}}\right].$$

since, the term in the bracket is the sum of probabilities of a Hypergeormetric random variable $\mathcal{H}(N-2, r-2, \theta'')$, with $\theta'' = (M-2)/(N-2)$, and then is equal to one.

We get

$$\mathbb{E}(Y_r(Y_r-1) = \frac{M(M-1)\ r(r-1)}{N(N-1)},$$

and finally,

$$\begin{aligned} VarY_r &= \frac{M(M-1)\ r(r-1)}{N(N-1)} + \frac{rM}{N} - \frac{r^2M^2}{N^2} \\ &= r\frac{M}{N}(\frac{N-M}{N})(\frac{1-r}{N}). \end{aligned}$$

In summary, we have

$$\mathbb{E}(Y_r) = r\theta$$

and

$$Var\ Y_r = r\theta(1-\theta)(1-f),$$

where

$$f = \frac{r}{N}$$

(f) Exponential Random Variable : $X \sim \mathcal{E}(\lambda)$**,** $\lambda > 0$.

We remind that

$$\mathbb{P}(X = k) = \frac{\lambda^k}{k!}e^{-\lambda}$$

for $k = 0, 1, ...$ Then

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathbb{E}(X) &= \sum_{k=0}^{\infty} k \times \frac{\lambda^k}{k!}e^{-\lambda} \\
&= \sum_{k=1}^{\infty} \frac{\lambda^k}{(k-1)!}e^{-\lambda} \\
&= \lambda \sum_{k=1}^{\infty} \frac{\lambda^{k-1}}{(k-1)!}e^{-\lambda}
\end{aligned}$$

By setting $k' = k - 1$, we have

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathbb{E}(X) &= \lambda e^{-\lambda} \sum_{k'=0}^{\infty} \frac{\lambda^{k'}}{k'!} \\
&= \lambda e^{-\lambda} e^{\lambda} \\
&= \lambda.
\end{aligned}$$

The factorial moment of second order is

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathbb{E}(X(X-1)) &= \sum_{k=0}^{\infty} k(k-1) \times \frac{\lambda^k}{k!}e^{-\lambda} \\
&= \sum_{k=2}^{\infty} \frac{\lambda^k}{(k-2)!}e^{-\lambda} \\
&= \lambda^2 e^{-\lambda} \sum_{k=1}^{\infty} \frac{\lambda^{k-2}}{(k-2)!}
\end{aligned}$$

By putting $k'' = k - 1$, we get

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E}(X(X-1)) &= \lambda^2 e^{-\lambda} \sum_{k''=0}^{\infty} \frac{\lambda^{k'}}{k'!} \\ &= \lambda^2. \end{aligned}$$

Hence

$$\mathbb{E}(X^2) = \mathbb{E}(X(X-1)) + \mathbb{E}(X) = \lambda^2 + \lambda$$

and then we have

$$Var(X) = \lambda$$

Remark. For an exponential random variable, the mathematical expectation and the variance are both equal to the intensity λ.

6. Importance of the mean and the standard deviation

Let us denote the mean of a random variable X by m. The mean is meant to be a central parameter of X and it is expected that the values of X are near the mean m. This is not always true. Actually, the standard deviation measures how the values are near the mean.

We already saw in Property (P3) that a null standard deviation means that there is no deviation from the mean and that X is exactly equal to the mean.

Now, in a general case, the Tchebychev inequality may be used to measure the deviation of a random variable X from its mean. Here is that inequality :

PROPOSITION 1. *(**Tchebychev Inequality**). if $\sigma_X^2 = Var(X) > 0$, then for any $\lambda > 0$, we have*

$$\mathbb{P}(|X - E(X)| \ > \ \lambda \ \sigma_X) \leq \frac{1}{\lambda^2}.$$

Commentary. This inequality says that the probability that X deviates from its mean by at least $\lambda\sigma_X$ is less than one over λ.

In general terms, we say this : that X deviates from its mean by at least a multiple of σ_X is all the more unlikely that multiple is large. More precisely, the probability that that X deviates from its mean by at least a multiple of σ_X is bounded by the inverse of the square of that multiple. This conveys the fact that the standard deviation controls how the observations are near the mean.

Proof. Let us begin to prove the Markov's inequality. Let Y be a non-negative random variable with values $\{y_j, \ j \in J\}$. Then, for any $\lambda > 0$, the following Markov Inequality

$$\mathbb{P}(Y \ > \ \mathbb{E}(Y)) \ < \ \frac{1}{\lambda}, \tag{6.1}$$

holds. Before we give the proof of this inequality, we make a remark. By the formula in Theorem 2 on Chapter 4, we have for any number y,

$$\mathbb{P}(Y \leq y) = \sim y_i \leq y \mathbb{P}(Y = y_i). \tag{6.2}$$

Let us give now the proof of the inequality (6.1). Since, by the assumptions, $y_j \geq 0$ for all $j \in J$, we have

$$\begin{aligned}\mathbb{E}(Y) &= \sum_{j\in J} y_j \mathbb{P}(Y = y_j) \\ &= \sum_{y_j \leq \lambda \mathbb{E}(Y)} y_j \mathbb{P}(Y = y_i) + \sum_{y_j > \lambda \mathbb{E}(Y)} y_j \mathbb{P}(Y = y_j).\end{aligned}$$

Then by getting rid of the first term and use Formula (6.2) to get

$$\begin{aligned}\mathbb{E}(Y) &\geq \sum_{y_j > \lambda \mathbb{E}(Y)} y_j \mathbb{P}(Y = y_j) \\ &\geq (\lambda \mathbb{E}(Y)) \times \sum_{y_j > \lambda \mathbb{E}(Y)} \mathbb{P}(Y = y_j) \\ &= (\lambda \mathbb{E}(Y)) \times \mathbb{P}(Y > \lambda \mathbb{E}(Y)).\end{aligned}$$

By comparing the two extreme members of this latter formula, we get the Markov inequality in Formula (6.1).

Now, let us apply the Markov's inequality to the random variable

$$Y = (X - \mathbb{E}(X))^2.$$

By definition, we have $E(Y) = Var(X) = \sigma^2$. The application of Markov's inequality to Y leads to

$$\begin{aligned}\mathbb{P}(|X - \mathbb{E}(X)| > \lambda\sigma) &= \mathbb{P}(|X - \mathbb{E}(X)|^2 > \lambda^2\sigma^2) \\ &\leq \frac{1}{\lambda^2}.\end{aligned}$$

An this finishes the proof.

Application of the Tchebychev's Inequality : Confidence intervals of X around the mean.

The Chebychev's inequality allows to describe the deviation of the random variable X from mean m_X in the following probability covering

$$\mathbb{P}\left(m_X - \Delta \leq X \leq m + \Delta\right) \geq 1 - \alpha. \tag{6.3}$$

This relation say that we are $100(1-\alpha)\%$ **confident** that X lies in the interval $I(m) = [m - \Delta m, m + \Delta m]$. If Formula (6.3) holds,

$I(m_X) = [m_X - \Delta, m_X + \Delta]$ is called a $(1-\alpha)$-confidence interval of X.

By using the Chebychev's inequality, $I(m_X, \alpha) = [m_X - \sigma_X/\sqrt{\alpha}, m_X + \sigma_X/\sqrt{\alpha}]$ is a $(1-\alpha)$-confidence interval of X, that is

$$\mathbb{P}\left(m_X - \frac{\sigma_X}{\sqrt{\alpha}} \leq X \leq m_X + \frac{\sigma_X}{\sqrt{\alpha}}\right) \geq 1 - \alpha. \tag{6.4}$$

Let us make two remarks.

(1) The confidence intervals are generally used for small values of α, and most commonly for $\alpha = 5\%$. And we have a 95% confidence interval of X in the form (since $1/\sqrt{\alpha} = 4.47$)

$$\mathbb{P}\left(m_X - 4.47\ \sigma_X \leq X \leq m_X + 4.47\sigma_X\right) \geq 95\%. \tag{6.5}$$

95%-confidence intervals are used for comparing different groups with respect to the same character X.

(2) Denote by

$$RVC_X = \left|\frac{\sigma}{m}\right|.$$

Formula 6.4 gives for $0 < \alpha < 1$,

$$\mathbb{P}\left(1 + \frac{RVC_X}{\sqrt{\alpha}} \leq \left|\frac{X}{m}\right| \leq 1 + \frac{RVC_X}{\sqrt{\alpha}}\right) \geq \alpha.$$

The coefficient RVC_X is called the Relative Variation Coefficient of X which indicates how small the variable X deviates from its mean. Generally, it is expected that RVC_X is less 30% for a homogeneous variable.

(3) The confidence intervals obtained by the Tchebychev's inequality are not not so precise as we may need them. Actually, they are mainly used for theoretical purposes. In Applied Statistics analysis, more sophisticated confidence intervals are used. For example, normal confidence interval are systematically exploited. But for learning purposes, Tchebychev confidence intervals are good tools.

Let us now prove Formula (6.4).

Proof of Formula 6.4. Fix $0 < \alpha < 1$ and $\varepsilon > 0$. Let us apply the Chebychev inequality to get

$$\mathbb{P}(|X - \mathbb{E}(X)| \ > \ \varepsilon) = \mathbb{P}(|X - E(X)| \ > \ ((\frac{\varepsilon}{\sigma_X})\ \sigma)) \leq \frac{\sigma_X^2}{\varepsilon^2}.$$

Let

$$\alpha = \frac{\sigma_X^2}{\varepsilon^2}.$$

We get

$$\varepsilon = \frac{\sigma_X}{\sqrt{\alpha}}$$

and then

$$\mathbb{P}\left(|X - m_X| \ > \ \frac{\sigma_X}{\sqrt{\alpha}}\right) \leq \alpha,$$

which equivalent to

$$\mathbb{P}\left(|X - m_X| \ \leq \ \frac{\sigma_X}{\sqrt{\alpha}}\right) \geq 1 - \alpha,$$

and this is Formula (6.3).

CHAPTER 6

Random couples

This chapter is devoted to an introduction to the study of probability laws and usual parameters of random couples (X,Y) and related concepts. Its follows the lines of Chapters 4 and 5 which focused on real-valued random variables. As in the aforementioned chapter, here again, we focus on discrete random couples.

1. Strict and Extended Values Set for a Discrete Random Variable

A discrete random couple (X, Y) takes its values in a set of the form

$$\mathcal{SV}_{(X,Y)} = \{(a_i, b_j), (i, j) \in K\},$$

where K is an enumerable set with

$$\forall (i, j) \in K,\ \mathbb{P}((X, Y) = (a_i, b_j)) > 0. \tag{1.1}$$

We say that $\mathcal{SV}_{(X,Y)}$ is a **strict** support or a domain or a values set of the random couple (X, Y), if and only if, all its elements are taken by (X, Y) with a nonzero probabilities, as in (1.1). Remark for once that adding to $\mathcal{SV}_{(X,Y)}$ supplementary points (x, y) which are not taken by (X, Y), meaning that $\mathbb{P}((X, Y) = (x, y)) = 0$, does not change anything regarding computations using the probability law of (X, Y). If we have such points in a values set, we call this latter an **extended values set**.

We consider the first projections of the couple values defined as follows :

$$(a_i, b_j) \hookrightarrow a_i.$$

By forming a set of these projections, we obtain a set

$$\mathcal{V}_X = \{x_h, h \in I\}.$$

For any $i \in I$, x_i is equal to one of the projections a_i for which there exists at least one b_j such that $(a_i, b_j) \in \mathcal{SV}_{(X,Y)}$. It is clear that $\mathcal{V}_X$ is

the strict values set of X.

We have to pay attention to the possibility of having some values x_i that are repeated while taking all the projections $(a_i, b_j) \hookrightarrow a_i$. Let us give an example.

Let

$$\mathcal{SV}_{(X,Y)} = \{(1,2),(1,3),(2,2),(2,4)\} \tag{1.2}$$

with $\mathbb{P}((X,Y) = (1,2)) = 0.2, \mathbb{P}((X,Y) = (1,3)) = 0.3, \mathbb{P}((X,Y) = (2,2)) = 0.1$ and $\mathbb{P}((X,Y) = (2,4)) = 0.4$..

We have

$$\mathcal{V}_X = \{1,2\}.$$

Here the projections $(a_i, b_j) \hookrightarrow a_i$ give the value 1 two times and the value 2 two times.

We may and do proceed similarly for the second projections

$$(a_i, b_j) \hookrightarrow b_i,$$

to define

$$\mathcal{V}_Y = \{y_j, j \in J\},$$

as the strict values set of Y.

We express a strong warning to not think that the strict values set of the couple is the Cartesian product of the two strict values sets of X and Y, that is

$$\mathcal{SV}_{(X,Y)} = \mathcal{V}_X \times \mathcal{V}_Y.$$

In the example of (1.2), we may check that

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{V}_X \times \mathcal{V}_Y &= \{1,2\} \times \{2,3,4\} \\ &= \{(1,2),(1,3),(1,4),(2,2),(2,3),(2,4)\} \\ &\neq \{(1,2),(1,3),(2,2),(2,4)\} \\ &= \mathcal{SV}_{(X,Y)}. \end{aligned}$$

Now, even we have this fact, we may use

$$\mathcal{V}_{(X,Y)} = \mathcal{V}_X \times \mathcal{V}_Y,$$

as an extended values set and remind ourselves that some of the elements of $\mathcal{V}_{(X,Y)}$ may be assigned null probabilities by $\mathbb{P}_{(X,Y)}$.

In our example (1.2), using the extended values sets leads to the probability law represented in Table 1.

TABLE 1. Simple example of a probability law in dimension 2

$X \setminus Y$	2	3	4	X
1	0.2	0.3	0	0.5
2	0	0.1	0.4	0.5
Y	0.2	0.4	0.4	1

In this table,

(1) We put the probability $\mathbb{P}((X,Y)=(x,y))$ at the intersection of the value x of X (in line) and the value y of Y (in column).

(2) In the column X, we put, at each line corresponding to a value x of X, the sum of all the probability of that line. This column represents the probability law of X, as we will see it soon.

(3) In the line Y, we put, at each column corresponding to a value y of Y, the sum of all the probability of that column. This line represents the probability law of Y.

Conclusion. In our study of random couples (X,Y), we always may use an extended values set of the form

$$\mathcal{V}_{(X,Y)} = \mathcal{V}_X \times \mathcal{V}_Y,$$

where $\mathcal{V}_X$ is the strict values set of X and $\mathcal{V}_Y$ the strict values set of Y. If $\mathcal{V}_X$ and $\mathcal{V}_Y$ are finite with relatively small sizes, we may appeal to tables like Table 1 to represent the probability law of (X,Y).

2. Joint Probability Law and Marginal Probability Laws

.

Let (X,Y) be a discrete random couple such that $\mathcal{V}_X = \{x_i\}, i \in I\}$ is the strict values set of X and $\mathcal{V}_Y = \{y_j, j \in J\}$ the strict values set of Y, with $I \subset \mathbb{N}$ and $J \subset \mathbb{N}$. The probability law of (X,Y) is given on the extended values set

$$\mathcal{V}_{(X,Y)} = \mathcal{V}_X \times \mathcal{V}_Y,$$

by

$$\mathbb{P}(X = x_i,\ Y = y_j), (i,j) \in I \times J. \tag{2.1}$$

where the event $(X = x_i,\ Y = y_j)$ is a notation of the intersection $(X = x_i) \cap (Y = y_j)$.

This probability law may be summarized in Table 2.

X Y	y_1	.....	y_j	.....	X
x_1	$\mathbb{P}(X = x_1,\ Y = y_1)$	.....	$\mathbb{P}(X = x_1,\ Y = y_j)$	.....	$\mathbb{P}(X = x_1)$
x_2	$\mathbb{P}(X = x_2,\ Y = y_1)$	.....	$\mathbb{P}(X = x_2,\ Y = y_j)$	.....	$\mathbb{P}(X = x_2)$
....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....
x_i	$\mathbb{P}(X = x_i,\ Y = y_1)$	.....	$\mathbb{P}(X = x_i,\ Y = y_j)$	.....	$\mathbb{P}(X = x_i)$
...	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....
Y	$\mathbb{P}(Y = y_1)$	.....	$\mathbb{P}(Y = y_j)$	.....	100%

This table is formed as follows :

(1) We put the probability $\mathbb{P}((X,Y) = (x_i, y_j))$ at the intersection of the value x_i of X (in line) and the value y_j of Y (in column).

(2) In the column X, we put, at each line the corresponding to a value x_i of X, the sum of all the probability of that line. As we will see it later, this column represents the probability law of X.

(3) In the line Y, we put, at each column corresponding to a value y of Y, the sum of all the probability of that column. This line represents the probability law of Y.

Let us introduce the following terminology.

Joint Probability Law.

The joint probability law of (X,Y) is simply the probability law of the couple, which is given in (2.1).

Marginal probability laws.

The probability laws of X and Y are called marginal probability laws.

Here is how we get the marginal probability law of X and Y from the joint probability law. Let us begin by X.

We already knew, from Formula (2.3), that any event B can be decomposed into

$$B = \sum_{j \in J} B \cap (Y = y_j).$$

So, for a fixed $i \in I$, we have

$$(X = x_i) = \sum_{j \in J} (X = x_i) \cap (Y = y_j) = \sum_{j \in J} (X = x_i, \quad Y = y_j).$$

By applying the additivity of the probability measure, it comes that

$$\mathbb{P}(X = x_i) = \sum_{j \in J} \mathbb{P}(X = x_i, \quad Y = y_j), \quad i \in I. \tag{2.2}$$

By doing the same of Y, we get

$$\mathbb{P}(Y = y_j) = \sum_{i \in I} \mathbb{P}(X = x_i, \quad Y = y_j), \quad j \in J. \tag{2.3}$$

We may conclude as follows.

(1) The marginal probability law of X, given is (2.2) is obtained by summing the joint probability law over the values of Y.

In Table 2, the marginal probability law of X is represented by the last column, in which each line corresponding to a value x_i of X is the sum of all the probability of that line.

(2) The marginal probability law of Y, given is (2.3) is obtained by summing the joint probability law over the values of X.

In Table 2, the marginal probability law of Y is represented by the last line, in which each column corresponding to a value y_j of Y is the sum of all the probability of that column.

(3) The box at the intersection of the last line and the last column contains the unit value, that is, at the same time, the sum of all the joint probabilities, all marginal probabilities of X and all marginal probabilities of Y.

Usually, it is convenient to use the following notations :

$$p_{i,j} = \mathbb{P}(X = x_i,\ Y = y_j), (i,j) \in I \times J. \tag{2.4}$$

$$p_{i,.} = \mathbb{P}(X = x_i), \quad i \in I. \tag{2.5}$$

and

$$p_{.,j} = \mathbb{P}(Y = y_j), \quad j \in J. \tag{2.6}$$

We have the formulas

$$p_{i,.} = \mathbb{P}(X = x_i, Y \in \Omega) \tag{2.7}$$

$$= \sum_{j\ \in\ J} p_{i,j} \quad i \in I. \tag{2.8}$$

and

$$p_{.,j} = \mathbb{P}(X \in \Omega, Y = y_j) \tag{2.9}$$

$$= \sum_{i\ \in\ I} p_{i,j}, \quad j \in J. \tag{2.10}$$

3. Independence

We come back to the concept of conditional probability and independence that was introduced in Chapter 3. This section is developed for real-values random variables. But we should keep in mind that the theory is still valid for E-valued random variables, where $E = \mathbb{R}^k$. When a result hold only for real-valued random variables, we will clearly specify it.

I - Independence.

(a) Definition.

We remind that, by definition (see Property (P6) in Chapter 5), X and Y are independent if and only if one of the following assertions holds.

(CI1) For all $i \in J$ and $j \in J$,

$$p_{ij} = p_{i,.} \times p_{.,j}.$$

(CI2) For any subsets A and B of $E = \mathbb{R}$

$$\mathbb{P}(X \in A, Y \in B) = \mathbb{P}(X \in A) \times \mathbb{P}(Y \in B)$$

(CI3) For any non negative functions $f, g : \Omega \mapsto E$,

$$\mathbb{E}(h(X)g(Y)) = \mathbb{E}(h(X)) \times \mathbb{E}(g(X))$$

Actually, Property (P6) in Chapter 5, only establishes the equivalence between (CI1) and (CI3). But clearly, (CI3) implies (CI2) by using the following functions

$$h = 1_A \text{ and } g = 1_A.$$

Also (CI2) implies (CI1) by using

$$A = \{x_i\} \text{ and } B = \{y_j\}.$$

We get the equivalence between the three assertions by the circular argument :

$$(CI1) \Rightarrow (CI3) \Rightarrow (CI2) \Rightarrow (CI1).$$

(b) New tools for assessing the independence.

For a real-valued random variable X, we may define the two following functions depending on the law of X.

(MGF1) The first moment generating function of X :

$$\Phi_X(s) = \mathbb{E}(\exp(sX)) = \sum_{i \in I} \mathbb{P}(X = x_i) \exp(sx_i), \quad s \in \mathbb{R}.$$

(MGF2) The second moment generating function of X :

$$\Psi_X(s) = \mathbb{E}(s^X) = \sum_{i\in I} \mathbb{P}(X = x_i)s^{x_i}, s \in]0, 1].$$

It is clear that we have the following relation between these two functions :

$$\Psi_X(s) = \Phi_X(\log s) \quad and \Psi_X(1) = \Phi_X(0). \tag{3.1}$$

So, we do not need to study them separately. It is enough to study one of them and to transfer the obtained properties to the other. Since, the first is more popular, we will study it. Consequently, the first form is simply called the moment generating function (m.g.f). When we use the form given in (MGF2), we will call it by its full name as the *second m.g.t.*

Characterization of probability laws. We admit that the *m.g.t* of X, when it is defined, is characteristic of the probability law of X, meaning that two real-valued random variables having the same *m.g.t* have the same law. The same characterization is valid for the second *m.g.t*, because of the relation between the two *m.g.f* forms through Formula (3.1). The proof of this result, which is beyond the level of this book, will be presented in the monograph [**4**] of this series.

Each form of *m.g.f* has its own merits and properties. We have to use them in smart ways depending of the context.

The *m.g.f* for real-valued random variables may be extended to a couple of random variables. If X and Y are both real applications, we may define the bi-dimensional *m.g.t* of the couple (X, Y) by

(MGFC)
$$\Phi_{X,Y}(s, t) = \mathbb{E}(\exp(sX+Yt)) = \sum_{(i,j)\in I\times J} \mathbb{P}(X = x_i, Y = y_i) \exp(sx_i+ty_j),$$

for $(s, t) \in \mathbb{R}^2$.

The *m.g.t* has a nice and simple affine transformation formula. Indeed, if a and b are real numbers, we have for any for any $s \in \mathbb{R}$

$$\exp((aX + bs)) = e^{bs} \exp((as)X)$$

and then, we have

$$\begin{aligned}\Phi_Z(s) = \mathbb{E}(\exp((aX+b)s) & \\ &= \mathbb{E}(e^{bs}\exp((as)X) \\ &= e^{bs}\mathbb{E}(\exp((as)X) \\ &= e^{bs}\Phi_X(as).\end{aligned}$$

We obtained this remarkable formula : for any real numbers a and b, for any $s \in \mathbb{R}$, we have

$$\Phi_{aX+b}(s) = e^{bs}\Phi_X(as).. \tag{3.2}$$

Formula (3.2) is a useful too, to find news probability laws for known ones.

We are going to see two other interesting properties of these functions.

A - Moment generating Functions and Independence.

If X and Y are real-valued independent random variables, then we have :

For any $s \in \mathbb{R}$,

$$\Phi_{X+Y}(s) = \Psi_X(s) \times \Phi_Y(s),. \tag{3.3}$$

For any $(s,t) \in \mathbb{R}^2$,

$$\Phi_{(X,Y)}(s,t) = \Psi_X(s) \times \Phi_Y(t). \tag{3.4}$$

Before we give the proofs, let us enrich our list of independent conditions.

(CI4) Two real-valued random variables X and Y are independent if and only Formula (3.4) holds for any $(s,t) \in \mathbb{R}^2$.

This assertion also is beyond the current level. We admit it. We will prove it in [**4**].

Warning. Formula (3.4) characterizes the independence between two random variables, but not (3.3). Let us show it with this counter-example in [**13**], page 62, 2nd Edition.

Consider the random couple (X, Y) taking with domain $\mathcal{V}_{(X,Y)} = \{1, 2, 2\}^2$, and whose probability law is given by

XY	1	2	3	X
1	$\frac{2}{18}$	$\frac{1}{18}$	$\frac{3}{18}$	$\frac{6}{18}$
2	$\frac{3}{18}$	$\frac{2}{18}$	$\frac{1}{18}$	$\frac{2}{18}$
Y	$\frac{1}{18}$	$\frac{3}{18}$	$\frac{2}{18}$	$\frac{6}{18}$
Y	$\frac{6}{18}$	$\frac{6}{18}$	$\frac{6}{18}$	$\frac{18}{18}$

TABLE 2. Counter-example : (3.3) does not imply independence

We may check that this table gives a probability laws. Besides, we have :

(1) X and Y have a uniform distribution on $\{1, 2, 3\}$ with

$$\mathbb{P}(X = 1) = \mathbb{P}(X = 2) = \mathbb{P}(X = 3) = \frac{6}{18} = \frac{1}{3}$$

and

$$\mathbb{P}(Y = 1) = \mathbb{P}(Y = 2) = \mathbb{P}(Y = 3) = \frac{6}{18} = \frac{1}{3}.$$

(2) X and Y have the common *m.g.f*

$$\Phi_X(s) = \Phi_Y(s) = \frac{1}{3}(e^s + e^{2s} + e^{3s}), \quad s \in \mathbb{R}$$

(3) We have, for $s \in \mathbb{R}$,

$$\Phi_X(s)_Y(s) = \frac{1}{9}(e^{2s} + 2e^{3s} + 3e^{4s} + 2e^{5s} + e^{6s}) \tag{3.5}$$

$$= \frac{1}{18}(2e^{2s} + 4e^{3s} + 6e^{4s} + 4e^{5s} + 2e^{6s}) \tag{3.6}$$

(4) The random variable $Z = X + Y$ takes its values in $\{2, 3, 4, 5\}$. The events $(X = k)$, $2 \leq k \leq 6$ may be expressed with respect to the values of (X, Y) as follows

$$\begin{aligned}
(Z=2) &= (X=1,Y=1)\\
(Z=3) &= (X=1,Y=2)+(X=2,Y=1)\\
(Z=4) &= (X=1,Y=3)+(X=2,Y=2)+(X=3,Y=1)\\
(Z=5) &= (X=2,Y=3)+(X=3,Y=2)\\
(Z=6) &= (X=3,Y=3)
\end{aligned}$$

By combining this and the joint probability law of (X,Y) given in Table 3, we have

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathbb{P}(Z=2) &= \frac{2}{18}\\
\mathbb{P}(Z=3) &= \frac{4}{18}\\
\mathbb{P}(Z=4) &= \frac{6}{18}\\
\mathbb{P}(Z=5) &= \frac{4}{9}\\
\mathbb{P}(Z=6) &= \frac{2}{18}
\end{aligned}$$

(5) The *m.g.f* of $Z=X+Y$ is

$$\Phi_{X+Y}(s)=\frac{1}{18}(2e^{2s}+2e^{3s}+6e^{4s}+4e^{5s}+2e^{6s}) \tag{3.7}$$

(6) By combining Points (3) and (5), we see that Formula (3.3) holds.

(7) yet, we do not have independence, since, for example

$$\mathbb{P}(X=2,Y=1)=\frac{3}{18} \quad \neq \quad \frac{2}{18}\mathbb{P}(X=2)\times\mathbb{P}(Y=1).$$

□

Proofs of Formulas (3.3) and (3.4).

We simply use Property (CI3) below to get for any $s\in\mathbb{R}$,

$$\begin{aligned}\Phi_{X+Y}(s) &= \mathbb{E}(\exp(sX+sY)) \\ &= \mathbb{E}(\exp(sX)\times\exp(sY)) \text{ (Property of the exponential)} \\ &= \mathbb{E}(\exp(sX))\times\mathbb{E}(\exp(sY)) \text{ (By Property (CI3))} \\ &= \Phi_X(s)\times\Phi_Y(s)\end{aligned}$$

and $(s,t)\in\mathbb{R}^2$,

$$\begin{aligned}\Phi_{(X,Y)}(s,t) &= \mathbb{E}(\exp(sX+tY)) \\ &= \mathbb{E}(\exp(sX)\times\exp(tY)) \text{ (Property of the exponential)} \\ &= \mathbb{E}(\exp(sX))\times\mathbb{E}(\exp(tY)) \text{ (By Property (CI3))} \\ &= \Psi_X(s)\times\Psi_Y(t)\end{aligned}$$

B - Moment generating Functions and Moments.

Here, we do not deal with the existence of the mathematical expectation nor its finiteness. Besides, we admit that we may exchange the $\mathbb{E}$ symbol and the differentiation symbol $d()/ds$ in the form

$$\frac{d}{ds}(\mathbb{E}(f(s,X))=\mathbb{E}(\frac{d}{dt}f(s,X)), \tag{3.8}$$

where $f(t,X)$ is a function the real number t for a fixed value $X(\omega)$. The validity of this operation is completely settled in the course of Measure and Integration [**2**].

Let us successively differentiate $\Phi_X(s)$ with respect to s. Let us begin by a simple differentiation. We have :

$$\begin{aligned}(\Phi_X(s))' &= (\mathbb{E}(\exp(sX)))' \\ &= \mathbb{E}\left((\exp(sX)'\right) \\ &= \mathbb{E}\left(X\exp(sX)\right)\end{aligned}$$

Now, by iterating the differentiation, the same rule applies again and we have

$$\begin{aligned}(\Phi_X(s))' &= \mathbb{E}\left(X\exp(sX)\right)\\ (\Phi_X(s))'' &= \mathbb{E}\left(X^2\exp(sX)\right)\\ (\Phi_X(s))^{(3)} &= \mathbb{E}\left(X^3\exp(sX)\right)\\ (\Phi_X(s))^{(4)} &= \mathbb{E}\left(X^{(4)}\exp(sX)\right)\end{aligned}$$

We see that a simple induction leads to

$$\Phi_X(s)^{(k)} = \mathbb{E}\left(X^k\exp(sX)\right),$$

where $\Phi_X(s)^{(k)}$ stands to the k^{th} derivative of $\Phi_X(s)$. Applying this formula to zero gives

$$(\Phi_X(0))^{(k)} = \mathbb{E}\left(X^k\right).$$

We conclude : The moments of a real-valued random variable, if they exist, may be obtained from the derivative of the *m.g.t* of X applied to zero :

$$m_k(X) = \mathbb{E}\left(X^k\right) = (\Phi_X(0))^{(k)}, \quad k \geq 0. \tag{3.9}$$

Remark. Now, we understand why the function is called the generation moment functions of X, since it leads to all the finite moments of X.

C - The Second Moment generating Function and Moments.

First define for an integer $h \geq 1$, following functions from $\mathbb{R}$ to $\mathbb{R}$:

$$(x)_h = x \times (x-1) \times .... \times (x-h+1), x \in \mathbb{R}.$$

For example, we have : $(x)_1 = x$, $(x)_2 = x(x-1)$, $(x)_3 = x(x-1)(x-2)$. We already encountered these functions, since $\mathbb{E}((X)_2)$ is the factorial moment of second order. As well, we define

$$fm_h(X) = \mathbb{E}((X)_h), \quad h \geq 1.$$

as the factorial moment of order h. We are going to see how to find these factorial moments from the second *m.g.t.*

Using Formula (3.8) and the iterated differentiation of Ψ_X, together, lead to

$$\begin{aligned}
(\Psi_X(s))' &= \mathbb{E}\left(Xs^{X-1}\right)\\
(\Psi_X(s))'' &= \mathbb{E}\left(X(X-1)s^{X-2}\right)\\
(\Psi_X(s))^{(3)} &= \mathbb{E}\left(X(X-1)(X-2)s^{X-3}\right)\\
(\Psi_X(s))^{(4)} &= \mathbb{E}\left((X)_{(4)}s^{X-4}\right)
\end{aligned}$$

We see that a simple induction leads to

$$\Psi_X(s)^{(k)} = \mathbb{E}\left((X)_{(k)}s^{X-k}\right)$$

where $\Psi_X(s)^{(k)}$ stands to the k^{th} derivative of $\Psi_X(s)$. Applying this formula to the unity in $\mathbb{R}$ gives

$$(\Psi_X(1))^{(k)} = \mathbb{E}\left((X)_{(k)}\right)$$

We conclude as follows. The factorial moments of a real-valued random variable, if they exist, may be obtained from the derivatives of *m.g.t* of X applied to the unity :

$$fm_k(X) = \mathbb{E}\left((X)_{(k)}\right) = (\Psi_X(1))^{(k)}, \quad k \geq 0. \tag{3.10}$$

Remark. This function also yields the moments of X, indirectly through the factorial moments.

D - Probability laws convolution.

(1) Definition.

A similar factorization formula (3.3) for independent real random variables X and Y is easy to get when we use the second *m.g.f*, in virtue

of the relation 3.1. Indeed, if X and Y are independent, we have for any $s \in]0,1]$,

$$\Psi_{X+Y}(s) = \Phi_{X+Y}(\log s) = \Phi_X(\log s)\Phi_Y(\log s) = \Psi_X(s)\Psi_Y(s).$$

We may write this as follows. If X and Y are independent real random variables, then for any $s \in]0,1]$,

$$\Psi_{X+Y}(s) = \Psi_X(s)\Psi_Y(s). \tag{3.11}$$

However, many authors use another approach to prove the latter result. That approach may useful d in a number of studies. For example, it an instrumental tool for the study of Markov chains.

We are going to introduce it here.

Convolutions of the laws of X and Y. The convolution of two probability laws on $\mathbb{R}$ is the law of the addition of two real random variables following these probability laws.

If X and Y are independent real random variables of respective probability laws $\mathbb{P}_X$ and $\mathbb{P}_Y$, the probability law of $X+Y$, $\mathbb{P}_{X+Y}$, is called the convolution product of the probability laws $\mathbb{P}_X$ and $\mathbb{P}_Y$, denoted by

$$\mathbb{P}_X * \mathbb{P}_Y.$$

In the remainder of this part (D) of this section, we suppose for once that X and Y are independent real random variables.

Let us find the law of $Z = X + Y$. The domain of Z, defined by $\mathcal{V}_Z = \{z_k,\ k \in K\}$, is formed by the distinct values of the numbers $x_i + y_j,\ (i,j) \in I \times J$. Based on the following decomposition of Ω,

$$\Omega = \sum_{i\in I, j\in J} (X = x_i, Y = y_j),$$

we have for $k \in K$,

$$(X + Y = z_k) = \sum_{i\in I, j\in J} (X + Y = z_k) \cap (X = x_i, Y = y_j).$$

We may begin by summing over $i \in I$, and then, we have $y_j = z_k - x_i$ on the event $(X + Y = k, X = x_i, Y = y_j)$. Thus we have

$$(X + Y = k) = \sum_{i \in I} (X = x_i, Y = z_k - x_i).$$

Then, the independence between X and Y implies

$$\mathbb{P}(X + Y = k) = \sum_{i \in I} \mathbb{P}(X = x_i)\mathbb{P}(Y = z_k - x_i). \tag{3.12}$$

Warning. When we use this formula, we have to restrict the summation over $i \in I$ to the values of i such that the event $(Y = z_k - x_i)$ is not empty.

(2) Example.

Consider that X and Y both follow a Poisson law with respective parameters $\lambda > 0$ and $\mu > 0$. We are going to use Formula (3.12). Here for a fixed $k \in \mathbb{N} = \mathcal{V}_{X+Y}$, the summation over $i \in \mathbb{N} = \mathcal{V}_X$ will be restricted to $0 \leq i \leq k$, since the events $(Y = k - i)$ are impossible for $i > k$. Then we have :

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathbb{P}(X + Y = k) &= \sum_{i=0}^{k} \mathbb{P}(X = i)\mathbb{P}(Y = k - i) && (3.13)\\
&= \sum_{i=0}^{k} \frac{\lambda^i e^{-\lambda}}{i!} \times \frac{\mu^{k-i} e^{-\mu}}{(k-i)!} && (3.14)\\
&= \sum_{i=0}^{k} \frac{\lambda^i e^{-\lambda}}{i!} \times \frac{\mu^{k-i} e^{-\mu}}{(k-i)!} && (3.15)\\
&= \frac{e^{-(\lambda+\mu)}}{k!} \left(\sum_{i=0}^{k} \frac{k!}{i!(k-i)!} \lambda^{k-i} \mu^{k-i} \right) && (3.16)
\end{aligned}$$

Now, we apply the Newton's Formula (5.2) in Chapter 1 to get

$$\mathbb{P}(X + Y = k) = \frac{e^{-(\lambda+\mu)}(\lambda + \mu)^k}{k!}. \tag{3.17}$$

Conclusion. By the characterization of probability laws by their first or second *m.g.f*'s, whom we admitted in the beginning of this part I, we

infer from the latter result, that the sum of two independent Poisson random variables with parameters $\lambda > 0$ and $\mu > 0$ is a Poisson random variable with parameter $\lambda + \mu$. We may represent that rule by

$$\mathcal{P}(\lambda) * \mathcal{P}(\mu) = \mathcal{P}(\lambda + \mu).$$

(2) Direct Factorization Formula.

In the particular case where the X and Y take the non-negative integers values, we may use Analysis results to directly establish Formula (3.11).

Suppose that X and Y are independent and have the non-negative integers as values. Let $\mathbb{P}(X = k) = a_k$, $\mathbb{P}(Y = k) = b_k$ and $\mathbb{P}(X + Y = k) = c_k$, for $k \geq 0$. Formula (3.12) becomes

$$c_n = \sum_{k \geq 0} a_k b_{n-k}, \ n \geq 0. \tag{3.18}$$

Definition. The convolution of the two sequences of real numbers $(a_n)_{n\geq 0}$ and $(b_n)_{n\geq 0}$ is the sequence of real numbers $(c_n)_{n\geq 0}$ defined in (3.18).

If the sequence $(a_n)_{n\geq 0}$ is absolutely convergent, that is,

$$\sum_{n \geq 0} |a_n| < +\infty,$$

we may define the function

$$a(s) = \sum_{n \geq 0} a_n s^n < +\infty, \quad 0 < s \leq 1.$$

We have the following property.

LEMMA 3. *Let $(a_n)_{n\geq 0}$ and $(b_n)_{n\geq 0}$ be two absolutely convergent sequences of real numbers, and $(c_n)_{n\geq 0}$ be their convolution, defined in (3.18). Then we have*

$$c(s) = a(s)b(s), 0 < s \leq 1.$$

Proof. We have

$$c(s) = \sum_{n\geq 0} c_n s^n = \sum_{n\geq 0} \left(\sum_{k=0}^{n} a_k b_{n-k} \right) s^n = \sum_{n=0}^{\infty} \sum_{k=0}^{n} \left(a_k s^k\right) \left(b_{n-k} s^{n-k}\right)$$

$$= \sum_{n=0}^{\infty} \sum_{k=0}^{\infty} \left(a_k s^k\right) \left(b_{n-k} s^{n-k}\right) 1_{(k\leq n)}$$

Let us apply the Fubini property for convergent sequences of real numbers by exchanging the two summation symbols, to get

$$\begin{aligned} c(s) &= \sum_{k=0}^{\infty} \sum_{n=0}^{\infty} \left(a_k s^k\right) \left(b_{n-k} s^{n-k}\right) 1_{(k\leq n)} \\ c(s) &= \sum_{k=0}^{\infty} \sum_{n=k}^{\infty} \left(a_k s^k\right) \left(b_{n-k} s^{n-k}\right) \\ &= \sum_{k=0}^{\infty} \left(a_k s^k\right) \left\{ \sum_{n=k}^{\infty} \left(b_{n-k} s^{n-k}\right) \right\} \end{aligned}$$

The quantity in the brackets in the last line is equal to $b(s)$. To see this, it suffices to make the change of variables $\ell = n - k$ and ℓ runs from 0 to $+\infty$. QED.

By applying this lemma to the discrete probability laws with non-negative integer values, we obtain the factorization formula (3.11).

We concluding by saying that : it is much simpler to work with the first *m.g.f.* But in some situations, like when handling the Markov chains, the second *m.g.f* may be very useful.

F - Simple examples of *m.g.t.*.

Here, we use the usual examples of discrete probability law that were reviewed in Section 3 of Chapter 4 and the properties of the mathematical expectation stated in Chapter 5

(1) Constant c with $\mathbb{P}(X = c) = 1$:

$$\begin{aligned}\Phi_X(s) &= \mathbb{E}\left(\exp(sX)\right) = 1 \times e^{cs} \\ &= e^{cs}, s \in \mathbb{R}.\end{aligned}$$

(2) Bernoulli law $\mathcal{B}(p)$, $p \in]0,1[$.

$$\begin{aligned}\Phi_X(s) &= \mathbb{E}\left(\exp(sX)\right) = q \times e^{0s} + pe^{1s} \\ &= q + pe^s, s \in \mathbb{R}.\end{aligned}$$

(3) Geometric law $\mathcal{G}(p)$, $p \in]0,1[$.

$$\begin{aligned}\Phi_X(s) &= \mathbb{E}\left(\exp(sX)\right) \\ &= \sum_{n\geq 1} q^{n-1}pe^{ns} \\ &= (pe^s)\sum_{n\geq 1} q^{n-1}e^{(n-1)s}. \\ &= (pe^s)\sum_{k\geq 0} q^k e^{qs} \text{ (Change of variable) } k = n-1 \\ &= (pe^s)\sum_{k\geq 0}(qe^s)^k \\ &= \frac{pe^s}{1-qe^s}, \text{ for } 0 < qe^s < 1, \text{ i.e. } s < -\log q.\end{aligned}$$

(4) X is the number of failures before the first success $X \sim \mathcal{NF}(p)$, $p \in]0,1[$.

If X is the number of failures before the first success, then $Y = X + 1$ follows a geometric law $\mathcal{G}(p)$. Thus, we may apply Formula (3.2) and the $m.g.t$ of Y given by Point (3) above to have

$$\Phi X(s) = \Phi_{Y-1}(s) = e^{-s} \times \Phi Y(s) = e^{-s} \times \frac{pe^s}{1-qe^s} = \frac{p}{1-qe^s}.$$

(6) Discrete Uniform Law on 1,2,...,n $\mathcal{DU}(n)$, $n \geq 1$.

We have

$$\begin{aligned}\Phi_X(s) &= \mathbb{E}\left(\exp(sX)\right)\\ &= \sum_{1\leq i\leq n}\frac{1}{n}e^{is}\\ &= \frac{e^s(1+e^s+e^{2s}+...+e^{(n-1)s}}{n}\\ &= \frac{(e^{(n-1)s}-e^s}{n(e^s-1)}.\end{aligned}$$

(7) Binomial Law $\mathcal{B}(n,p)$, $p\in]0,1[$, $n\geq 1$.

Since a $\mathcal{B}(n,p)$ random variable has the same law as the sum of n independent Bernoulli $\mathcal{B}(p)$ random variables, the factorization formula (3.3) and the expression the *m.g.t* of a $\mathcal{B}(p)$ given in Point (2) above lead to

$$\Phi_X(s) = (q+pe^s)^n, s\in\mathbb{R}.$$

(8) Negative Binomial Law $\mathcal{NB}(k,p)$, $p\in]0,1[$, $k\geq 1$.

Since a $\mathcal{NB}(k,p)$ random variable has the same law as the sum of k independent Geometric $\mathcal{G}(p)$ random variables, the factorization formula (3.3) and the expression the *m.g.t* of a $\mathcal{G}(p)$ given in Point (3) above lead to

$$\Phi_X(s) = \left(\frac{pe^s}{1-qe^s}\right)^k, \text{ , for } 0<qe^s<1, \text{ i.e. } s<-\log q.$$

(9) Poisson Law $\mathcal{P}(\lambda)$, $\lambda>0$.

We have

$$\begin{aligned}
\Phi_X(s) &= \mathbb{E}\left(\exp(sX)\right) \\
&= \sum_{k\geq 0} \frac{\lambda^k e^\lambda}{k!} e^{ks} \\
&= e^{-\lambda} \sum_{k\geq 0} \frac{(\lambda e^s)^k}{k!} \\
&= e^{-\lambda} \exp(\lambda e^s) \text{ (Exponential Expansion)} \\
&= \exp(\lambda(e^s - 1)).
\end{aligned}$$

F - Table of some usual discrete probability laws.

Abbreviations.

Name	Symbol	Parameters	Domain
Const.	c	$c \in \mathbb{R}$	$\mathcal{V} = c$
Bernoulli	$\mathcal{B}(p)$	$0 < p < 1$	$\mathcal{V} = \{0, 1\}$
Discrete Uniform	$\mathcal{DU}(n)$	$n \geq 1$	$\mathcal{V} = \{1, ..., n\}$
Geometric	$\mathcal{G}(p)$	$0 < p < 1$	$\mathcal{V} = 1, 2, ...$
Binomial	$\mathcal{B}(n, p)$	$n \geq 1$, $0 < p < 1$	$\mathcal{V} = 0, 1, ..., n$
Negative Binomial	$\mathcal{NB}(k, p)$	$k \geq 1$, $0 < p < 1$	$\mathcal{V} = \{k, k+1, ...1\}$
Poisson	$\mathcal{P}(\lambda)$	$\lambda > 0$	$\mathcal{V} = \mathbb{N} = \{0, 1, ...\}$

TABLE 3. Abbreviations and names of of some usual probability Laws on $\mathbb{R}$

Probability Laws

Symbol	Probability law.	(ME)	Variance	$m.g.t$ in (s)
c	$1,\ k=1$	c	0	$\exp(cs)$
$\mathcal{B}(p)$	$p,\ 1-p,\ k=0,1$	p	$p(1-p)$	$q+pe^s$
$\mathcal{DU}(n)$	$\frac{1}{n}, 1\leq i\leq n$	$\frac{n+1}{2}$		$\frac{(e^{(n-1)s}-e^s}{n(e^s-1)}$
$\mathcal{G}(p)$	$p(1-p)^{n-1}, n\geq 1$	$\frac{p}{q}$	$\frac{p}{q}$	$\frac{pe^s}{1-e^s}$
$\mathcal{B}(n,p)$	$\begin{pmatrix} n \\ k \end{pmatrix}(1-p)^{n-k}, 1\leq k\leq n$	np	$np(1-p)$	$(q+pe^s)^n$
$\mathcal{NB}(n)$	$\begin{pmatrix} n-1 \\ k-1 \end{pmatrix}p^k(1-p)^{n-k}, n\geq k$	$\frac{kp}{q}$	$\frac{kp}{q^2}$	$(\frac{pe^s}{1-e^s})^k$
$\mathcal{P}(\lambda)$	$\frac{\lambda\exp(-\lambda)}{k!}, k\geq 0$	λ	λ	$\exp(\lambda(e^s-1))$

TABLE 4. Probability Laws of some usual real-valued discrete random variables. (ME) stands for Mathematical Expectation.

4. An introduction to Conditional Probability and Expectation

I - Conditional Probability Laws.

The conditional probability law of X given $Y=y_j$ is given by the conditional probability formula

$$\mathcal{P}(X=x_i/Y=y_j)=\frac{\mathcal{P}(X=x_i,Y=y_j)}{\mathcal{P}(Y=y_j)}. \tag{4.1}$$

If we use an extend domain of Y, this probability is taken 0 if $\mathcal{P}(Y=y_j)=0$. We adopt the the following. For $i\in I, j\in J$, set

$$p_i^{(j)}=\mathcal{P}(X=x_i/Y=y_j).$$

According to the notation already introduced, we have for a fixed $j\in J$

$$p_i^{(j)}=\frac{p_{i,j}}{p_{.,j}},\ i\in I.. \tag{4.2}$$

We may see, by Formula (2.10), that for each $j\in J$, the numbers $p_i^{(j)},\ i\in I$, stands for a discrete probability measure. It is called the probability law of X given $Y=y_j$.

We may summarize the conditional laws in Table 4.

X	y_1	$\cdots$	y_j	$\cdots$
x_1	$p_1^{(1)}$	$\cdots$	$p_1^{(j)}$	$\cdots$
x_2	$p_2^{(1)}$	$\cdots$	$p_2^{(j)}$	$\cdots$
$\vdots$	$\vdots$	$\vdots$	$\vdots$	$\vdots$
x_i	$p_i^{(1)}$	$\cdots$	$p_i^{(j)}$	$\cdots$
$\vdots$	$\vdots$	$\vdots$	$\vdots$	$\vdots$
Total	100%	$\cdots$	100%	$\cdots$

TABLE 5. Conditional Probability Laws of X

Each column, at the exception of the first, represents a conditional probability law of X. This table is read column by column.

If we have considered the conditional probability laws of Y given a values x_i of X, we would have a table to be read by lines, each line representing a conditional probability law of Y. We only study the conditional probability laws of X. The results and formulas we obtained are easy to transfer to the conditional laws of Y.

The most remarkable conclusion of this point is the following :

The random variables (not necessarily real-valued) X and Y are independent if and only if any any conditional probability law of X given a value of Y is exactly the marginal probability law of X (called its unconditional probability law).

This is easy and comes from the following lines. X and Y are independent if and only if for any $j \in J$, we have

$$p_{i,j} = p_{i,.} \times p_{.,j},\ i \in I.$$

This assertion is equivalent to : for any $j \in J$, we have

$$p_i^{(j)} = \frac{p_{i,j}}{p_{.,j}} = \frac{p_{i,.} \times p_{.,j}}{p_{.,j}} = p_{i,.},\ i \in I.$$

Then, X and Y are independent if and only if for any $j \in J$,

$$p_i^{(j)} = p_{i,.},\ i \in I.$$

We denote by $X^{(j)}$ a random variable taking the same values as X whose probability law is the conditional probability law of X given

$Y = y_j$.

II - Computing the mathematical expectation of a function of X.

Let $h(X)$ be a real-valued function of X. We define the mathematical expectation of X given $Y = y_j$, denoted by $\mathbb{E}(h(X)/Y = y_j)$ as the mathematical expectation of $h(X^{(j)})$. It is then given by

$$\mathbb{E}(h(X^{(j)})) = \sum_{i \in I} h(x_i) p_i^{(j)}.$$

This gives the two expressions :

$$\mathbb{E}(h(X)/Y = y_j) = \sum_{i \in I} h(x_i) p_i^{(j)}. \tag{4.3}$$

or

$$\mathbb{E}(h(X)/Y = y_j) = \sum_{i \in I} h(x_i) \mathcal{P}(X = x_i/Y = y_j). \tag{4.4}$$

It is clear that, by construction, the mathematical expectation given $Y = y_j$ is linear. If Z is another discrete random variable and $\ell(Z)$ is a real-valued function of Z, if a and b are two real numbers, we have, for each $j \in J$,

$$\mathbb{E}(ah(X) + b\ell(Z)/Y = y_j) = a\mathbb{E}(h(X)/Y = y_j) + b\mathbb{E}(\ell(Z)/Y = y_j)$$

We have the interesting and useful formula for computing the mathematical expectation of $h(X)$.

$$\mathbb{E}(h(X)) = \sum_{j \in J} \mathbb{P}(Y = y_j) \mathbb{E}(h(X)/Y = y_j). \tag{4.5}$$

Let us give a proof of this formula. We have,

$$\begin{aligned}
& \sum_{j\in J}\mathbb{P}(Y=y_j)\mathbb{E}(h(X)/Y=y_j) \\
= & \sum_{j\in J}\mathbb{P}(Y=y_j)\sum_{i\in I}h(x_i)p_i^{(j)}, (\text{ by Forumla (4.3)}) \\
= & \sum_{j\in J}\sum_{i\in I}h(x_i)\mathbb{P}(Y=y_j)p_i^{(j)} \\
= & \sum_{j\in J}\sum_{i\in I}h(x_i)\mathbb{P}(X=x_i,\ Y=y_j), (\text{ by definition in Formula (4.2) }) \\
= & \sum_{i\in I}h(x_i)\sum_{j\in J}\mathbb{P}(X=x_i,Y=y_j), (\text{ by Fubini's rule}) \\
= & \sum_{i\in I}h(x_i)\mathbb{P}(X=x_i) \\
= & \mathbb{E}(h(X))
\end{aligned}$$

A simple Exercise. Let X_1, X_2, ..., be a sequence of real-valued discrete random variables with common mean μ and let Y a non-negative integer real-valued discrete random variable whose mean is λ. Define

$$S = X_1 + X_2 + \cdots + X_Y = \sum i = 1^Y X_i.$$

Show that $\mathbb{E}(S) = \mu\lambda$.

Solution. Let us apply Formula (4.5). First, we have for any $j \in J$

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathbb{E}(S/Y=y_j) &= \mathbb{E}(X_1+X_2+\cdots+X_Y/Y=y_j) \\
&= \mathbb{E}(X_1+X_2+\cdots+X_Y/Y=y_j) \\
&= \mathbb{E}(X_1+X_2+\cdots+X_{y_j}/Y=y_j) \\
&= \mathbb{E}(X_1+X_2+\cdots+X_{y_j})(\text{since the number of terms is non nonrandom}) \\
&= \mu y_j
\end{aligned}$$

Now, the application of Formula (4.5) gives

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathbb{E}(S) &= \sum_{j\in J}\mathbb{P}(Y=y_j)\mathbb{E}(Z/Y=y_j) \\
&= \mu\sum_{j\in J}\mathbb{P}(Y=y_j)y_j \\
&= \mu\mathbb{E}(Y) = \mu\lambda.
\end{aligned}$$

Conditional Expectation Random Variable.

Now, Let us consider $\mathbb{E}(h(X)/Y = y_j)$ as a function of y_j denoted $g(y_j)$. So, g is real-value function which is defined on a domain including the values set of Y, such that for any $j \in J$

$$\mathbb{E}(h(X)/Y = y_j) = g(y_j)$$

This function if also called the regression function of X given Y.

Definition. The random variable $g(Y)$ is the conditional expectation of $h(X)$ given Y and is denoted by $\mathbb{E}(h(X)/Y)$.

Warning. The conditional expectation of a real-valued function of $h(X)$ given Y is a random valued.

Properties.

(1) *How to use the conditional expectation to compute the mathematical expectation?.*

We have an extrapolation of Formula (4.5) in the form :

$$\mathbb{E}(h(X)/Y) = \mathbb{E}\bigg(\mathbb{E}(h(X)/Y)\bigg).$$

Let us consider the exercise just given above. We had for each $j \in J$

$$\mathbb{E}(S/Y = y_j) = g(y_j),$$

with $g(y) = \mu y$. Then we have $\mathbb{E}(S/Y) = \mu Y$. Next, we get

$$\mathbb{E}\bigg(\mathbb{E}(h(X)/Y)\bigg) = \mathbb{E}(\mu Y) = \mu\mathbb{E}(Y) = \mu\lambda.$$

(2) *Case were X and Y are independent.*

We have

$$\mathbb{E}(h(X)/Y) = \mathbb{E}(h(X)).$$

Proof. Suppose that X and Y are independent. So for any $(i,j) \in I \times J$, we have

$$\mathcal{P}(X = x_i / Y = y_j) = \mathcal{P}(X = x_i).$$

Then, by Formula (4.4)

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E}(h(X)/Y = y_j) &= \sum_{i \in I} h(x_i)\mathcal{P}(X = x_i / Y = y_j) \\ &= \sum_{i \in I} h(x_i)\mathcal{P}(X = x_i) \\ &= \mathbb{E}(h(X)) \end{aligned}$$

QED.

(3) *Conditional Expectation of Y of a function of Y.*

Let ℓ a real-value function whose domain contains the values of Y. Then, we have

$$\mathbb{E}(h(X)/Y) = \ell(Y)\mathbb{E}(h(X)).$$

Proof. We have

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E}(\ell(Y)h(X)/Y = y_j) &= \mathbb{E}(\ell(y_j)h(X)/Y = y_j \\ \mathbb{E}(\ell(Y)h(X)/Y = y_j) &= \ell(y_j)\mathbb{E}(h(X)/Y = y_j \end{aligned}$$

So, if $\mathbb{E}(h(X)/Y = y_j) = g(y_j)$, the latter formula says that

$$\mathbb{E}(\ell(Y)h(X)/Y) = \ell(Y)g(Y) = \ell(Y)\mathbb{E}(h(X)/Y).$$

which was the target. QED.

This gives the rule : When computing a conditional expectation given Y, may get the factors that are functions of Y out of the conditional expectation.

In particular, if h is the function constantly equal to one, we have

$$\mathbb{E}(\ell(Y)) = \ell(Y).$$

The conditional expectation of a function of Y, given Y, is itself.

CHAPTER 7

Continuous Random Variables

Until now, we exclusively dealt with discrete random variables. Introducing probability theory in discrete space is a good pedagogical approach. Beyond this, we will learn in advanced courses that the general Theory of Measure and Integration and Probability Theory are based on the method on discretization. General formulas depending of measurable applications and/or probability measure are extensions of the same formulas established for discrete applications and/or discrete probability measures. This means that the formulas stated in this textbook, beyond their usefulness in real problems, actually constitute the foundation of the Probability Theory.

In this chapter we will explain the notion of continuous random variables as a consequence of the study of the cumulative distribution function (*cdf*) properties. We will provide a list of a limited number of examples as an introduction to a general chapter on probability laws.

Especially, we will see how our special guest, the **normal** or **Gaussian** probability law, has been derived from the historical works of *de Moivre* (1732) and Laplace (1801) using elementary real calculus courses.

1. Cumulative Distribution Functions of a Real-valued random Variable (*rrv*)

Let us begin by the following definition.

Definition. Let X be a *rrv*. The following function defined from $\mathbb{R}$ to $[0,1]$ by

$$F_X(x) = \mathbb{P}(X \leq x) \text{ for } x \in \mathbb{R},$$

is called the **cumulative distribution function** *cdf* of the random variable X.

Before we proceed any further, let us consider two very simple cases of *cdf*'s.

Example 1. Cumulative distribution function of a constant *rrv*. Let X be the constant *rrv* at a, that is

$$\mathbb{P}(X = a) = 1.$$

It is not difficult to see that we have the following facts : $(X \leq x) = \emptyset$ for $x < a$ and $(X \leq x) = \Omega$ for $x \geq a$. Based on these facts, we see that *cdf* of X is given by

$$F_X(x) = \begin{cases} 1 & \text{if} \quad x \geq a \\ 0 & \text{if} \quad x < a \end{cases} .$$

Example 2. Cumulative Distribution Function of Bernoulli a $\mathcal{B}(p)$ *rrv*.

Remark that $(X \leq x) = \emptyset$ for $x < 0$, $(X \leq x) = (X = 0)$ for $0 \leq x < 1$ and $(X \leq x) = (X = 1)$ for $x \geq 1$. From these remarks, we derive that :

$$F_X(x) = \begin{cases} 1 & x \geq 1 \\ 1 - p & 0 \leq x < 1 \\ 0 & x < 0 \end{cases} .$$

We may infer from the two previous example the general method of computing the *cdf* of a discrete *rrv*.

1.1. Cumulative Distribution Function of a Discrete *rrv*.

Suppose that X is a discrete *rrv* and takes its values in $\mathcal{V}_X = \{x_i, \quad i \in I\}$. We suppose that the x_i's are listed in an increasing order :

$$\{x_1 \leq x_2 \leq ... \leq x_j ...\},$$

with convention that $x_0 = -\infty$. Let us denote

$$p_k = \mathbb{P}(X = x_k), \quad j \geq 1.$$

As well, we may define the cumulative probabilities

$$p_1^* = p_1,$$

and

$$p_k^* = p_1 + ... + p_{k-1} + p_k.$$

We say that p_k^* is the cumulative probabilities up to $k \geq 1$.

The cumulative distribution function of X is characterized by

$$\mathbb{P}(X \leq x) = \begin{cases} p_k^* & \text{if } x_k \leq x < x_{k+1}, \text{ for some } k \geq 1 \\ 0 & \text{if otherwise} \end{cases} . \tag{1.1}$$

In short, we may write

$$\mathbb{P}(X \leq x) = p_j^* \text{ if } x_j \leq x < x_{j+1}, \tag{1.2}$$

while keeping in mind that $F_X(x)$ is *zero* if x is strictly less all the elements of $\mathcal{V}_X$(case where $\mathcal{V}_X$ is bounded below) and *one* if x is greater or equal to all the elements of $\mathcal{V}_X$ (case where $\mathcal{V}_X$ is bounded above).

Be careful about the fact that a discrete *rrv* may have an unbounded values both below and above. For example, let us consider a random variable X with values $\mathcal{V}_X = \{j \in \mathbb{Z}\}$ such that

$$\mathbb{P}(X = j) = \frac{1}{(2e-1)|j|!},$$

It is clear that $\mathcal{V}_X$ is unbounded. Proving that the sum of the probabilities given above is *one* is left to the reader an exercise. He or She is suggested to use Formula (3.9) of Chapter 4 in his or her solution.

Proof of (1.1).

We already knew that

$$(X \leq x) = \bigcup x_i \leq x (X = x_i).$$

Next, if $x_k \leq x < x_{k+1}$, the values x_j less or equal to x are exactly : x_1, x_2, ..., x_k. Combining these two remarks leads to

$$(X \leq x) = \bigcup_{i=1}^{i=k} (X = x_i).$$

By Theorem 2 in Chapter 4, we have

$$\mathbb{P}(X \leq x) = \sum_{i=1}^{k} \mathbb{P}(X = x_i) = p_k^*,$$

for $x_k \leq x < x_{k+1}$. Further, if $x < x_1$, the event $(X \leq x)$ is impossible and $\mathbb{P}(X \leq x) = 0$. This proves Formula 1.1.

1.2. Graphical Representation of the cumulative distribution function of a Discrete Random Variable.

The *cdf* of discrete random variables are piecewise constant functions, meaning that they take constant values on segments of $\mathbb{R}$. Here are some simple illustrations for finite values sets.

Example 3. Let X be a *rrv* whose values set and probability law are defined in the following table.

X	0	1	2	3
$\mathbb{P}(X = k)$	0.125	0.375	0.375	0.125
p_k^*	0.125	0.5	0.875	1

The graph of the associated *cdf* defined by

x	$x < 0$	$0 \leq x < 1$	$1 \leq x < 2$	$2 \leq x < 3$	$3x \geq 3$
$\mathbb{P}(X \leq x) = p_k^*$	0	0.125	0.5	0.875	1

can be found in Figure 1



FIGURE 1. DF

In the next section, we are going to discover properties of the *cdf* in the discrete approach. Next, we will take these properties as the definition of a*cdf* of an arbitrary *rrv*. By this way, it will be easy to introduce continuous *rrv*.

2. General properties of *cdf*'s

The properties of *cdf*'s are given in the following proposition.

PROPOSITION 2. *Let F_X the cdf of a discrete random variable X. Then, F_X fulfills the following properties :*

(1) $0 \leq F_X \leq 1$.

(2) $\lim x \to -\infty F_X(x) = 0$ *and* $\lim_{x\to+\infty} F_X(x) = 1$.

(3) *F_X is right-continuous.*

(4) *F_X is 1-non-decreasing, that is for $a \leq b$, $(a, b) \in \mathbb{R}^2$,*

$$\Delta_{a,b}F_X = F_X(b) - F_X(a) \geq 0. \tag{2.1}$$

Other terminology. *We will also say that F_X assigns non-negative lengths to intervals $[a, b]$, $a \leq b$. We will come back to this terminology.*

Proof.

A general remark. In the proof below, we will have to deal with limits of F_X. But F_X will be proved to be non-decreasing in Point (4). By Calculus Courses, general limits of non-decreasing functions, whenever they exist, are the same as monotone limits. So, when dealing with of limits of F_X, we restrict ourselves to monotone limits.

In the sequel, a broadly increasing (resp. decreasing) sequence to something *should be interpreted as* a non strictly increasing (resp. decreasing) to something.

Consequently, we begin by the proof of Point (4).

Proof of (4). Let a and b be real numbers such that $a \leq b$, then $(X \leq a) \subset (X \leq b)$. Since probability measures are non-decreasing, we get

$$F_X(a) = \mathbb{P}(X \leq a) \leq \mathbb{P}(X \leq b) = F_X(b),$$

and then

$$\Delta_{a,b}F_X = F_X(b) - F_X(a) \geq 0,$$

which is the targeted Formula 2.1.

Proof of (1). The proof of **(1)** is immediate since for any $x \in \mathbb{R}$, $F_X(x)$ is probability value.

Proof of (2).

First, consider a sequence $t(n), n \geq 1$, that broadly decreases to $-\infty$ as $n \uparrow +\infty$, that is $t(n) \downarrow -\infty$. Let $A_{t(n)} = (X \leq t(n))$. Then, the sequence of events $(A_{t(n)})$ broadly decreases to $\emptyset$, that is

$$\bigcap_{n\geq 1} A_{t(n)} = \emptyset.$$

By the continuity of Probability measures (See Properties (D) and (E) in Chapter 2), we have

$$0 = \mathbb{P}(\emptyset) = \lim_{n\downarrow+\infty} \mathbb{P}(A_{t(n)}),$$

that is, $F_X(t(n)) \downarrow 0$ for any sequence $t(n) \downarrow -\infty$ as $n \uparrow +\infty$. By the previous remark on monotone limits, this means that

$$\lim_{x\to-\infty} F_X(x) = 0.$$

Similarly, consider a broadly increasing sequence $t(n), n \geq 1$, to $+\infty$ as $n \uparrow +\infty$, that is $t(n) \uparrow +\infty$. Let $A_{t(n)} = (X \leq t(n))$. Then, the sequence of events $(A_{t(n)})$ broadly increases sense to Ω, that is

$$\bigcup_{n\geq 1} A_{t(n)} = \Omega.$$

By the continuity of Probability measures (See Properties (D) and (E) in Chapter 2), we have

$$1 = \mathbb{P}(\Omega) = \lim_{n\downarrow+\infty} \mathbb{P}(A_{t(n)}),$$

that is, $F_X(t(n)) \uparrow 0$ for any sequence $t(n) \uparrow +\infty$ as $n \uparrow +\infty$. By the previous remark on monotone limits, this means that

$$\lim_{x\to+\infty} F_X(x) = 1.$$

The proof of Point (2) is over.

Proof of 3. Let us show that F_X is right-continuous at any point $x \in \mathbb{R}$. Let $h(n), n \geq 1$ a sequence of real and non-negative numbers decreasing to 0 in a broad sense, that is $h(n) \downarrow 0$ as $n \uparrow +\infty$. We clearly have (use a drawing if not clear) that

$$(-\infty, x + h(n)] \downarrow (-\infty, x] \quad as \quad n \uparrow +\infty.$$

By using the fact the inverse image application X^{-1} preserves sets operations, we get that, as $n \uparrow +\infty$,

$$A_{x+h(n)} = (X \leq x+h(n)) = X^{-1}((-\infty, x + h(n)]) \downarrow X^{-1}((-\infty, x]) = (X \leq x) = A_x,$$

By the continuity of Probability measures (See Properties (D) and (E) in Chapter 2), we have

$$\mathbb{P}(A_{x+h(n)}) \downarrow \mathbb{P}(A_x),$$

that is $F_X(x + h(n)) \downarrow F_X(x)$, for any sequence $h(n) \downarrow 0$ as $n \uparrow +\infty$. From Calculus Courses, this means that

$$F_X(x + h) \downarrow F_X(x) \quad as \quad 0 < h \to 0$$

Hence F_X is right-continuous at x.

The previous properties allow us to state a general definition of the notion of cumulative distribution function and to unveil continuous real-valued random variables.

3. Real Cumulative Distribution Functions on $\mathbb{R}$

Let us begin by the general definition of a cumulative distribution function on $\mathbb{R}$.

Definition. A real-valued function F defined on $\mathbb{R}$ is a cumulative distribution function if and only if

(1) $0 \leq F \leq 1$.

(2) $\lim_{x \to -\infty} F_X(x) = 0$ and $\lim_{x \to +\infty} F_X(x) = 1$

(3) F is right-continuous.

(4) F is 1-non-decreasing.

Random Variable associated with a *cdf*.

Before we begin, let us make some remarks on the domain of a probability measure. So far, we used discrete probability measures defined of the power set $\mathcal{P}(\Omega)$ of the sample set Ω.

But it is possible to have a probability measure that is defined only on a subclass $\mathcal{A}$ of $\mathcal{P}(\Omega)$. In this case, we have to ensure the following points for the needs of the computations.

(1) The subclass $\mathcal{A}$ of $\mathcal{P}(\Omega)$ should contain the impossible event $\emptyset$ and the sure event Ω.

(2) Since we use the sets operations (union, intersection, difference of sets, complements of sets, etc.), The subclass $\mathcal{A}$ of $\mathcal{P}(\Omega)$ should be stable under sets operations, but only when they are applied at most a countable number of times.

(3) For an real-valued random variable X, we need to define its *cdf* $F_X(X \leq x), x \in \mathbb{R}$, we have to ensure that the events $(X \leq x)$ lie in $\mathcal{A}$ for all $x \in \mathbb{R}$.

The first two points hold for discrete probability measures when $\mathcal{A} = \mathcal{P}(\Omega)$ and the third point holds for a discrete real-valued random variable when $\mathcal{A} = \mathcal{P}(\Omega)$.

In general, a subclass $\mathcal{A}$ of $\mathcal{P}(\Omega)$ fulfilling the first two points is called a *fields of subsets* or a *σ-algebra of subsets* of Ω. An real-value application X defined on Ω such that events $(X \leq x)$ lie in $\mathcal{A}$ for all $x \in \mathbb{R}$, is called a *measurable* application, or a random variable, with respect to $\mathcal{A}$.

The consequence is that, you may see the symbol $\mathcal{A}$ and read about measurable application in the rest of this chapter and forwarding chapters. But, we do not pay attention to them. We only focus on the probability computations, assuming everything is well defined and works well, at least at this level.

We will have time and space for such things in the mathematical course on Probability Theory.

Now, it is time to introduce our definitions.

Definition.

Given a *cdf* F, we say that a random variable X defined on some probability $(\Omega, \mathcal{A}, \mathbb{P})$ possesses (or, is associated to) the *cdf* F, if and only if

$$\mathbb{P}(X \leq x) = F(x), \quad forall \quad x \in \mathbb{R}. \tag{3.1}$$

that is $F_X = F$. Each particular *cdf* is associated to a name of probability law that applies both to the *cdf* and to the *rrv*.

Immediate examples

Let us give the following examples.

Exponential law with parameter $\lambda > 0$, denoted $\mathcal{E}(\lambda)$.

A *rrv* X follows an Exponential law with parameter $\lambda > 0$, denoted $X \sim \mathcal{E}(\lambda)$ if and only its *cdf* is given by

$$F(x) = \begin{cases} 1 - e^{-\lambda x} & x \geq 0 \\ 0 & x < \end{cases}$$

Uniform law on (a, b), denoted $\mathcal{U}(a, b)$, $a < b$

A *rrv* X follows a uniform law on $[a, b]$, $a < b$, denoted $X \sim \mathcal{U}(a, b)$ if and only its *cdf* is given by

$$F(x) = \begin{cases} 1 & if \quad x > a \\ (x - a)/(b - a) & if \quad a \leq x \leq b \\ 0 & if \quad x < a \end{cases} .$$

These two functions are clearly *cdf*'s. Besides, they are continuous *cdf*'s.

4. Absolutely Continuous Distribution Functions

Let us begin by definitions and examples.

4.1. Definitions and examples. Let F_X be the *cdf* of an *rrv* X. Suppose that F_X satisfies :

(a)

$$f_x = F'_X = \frac{dF_X}{dx} \text{ exists on } \mathbb{R}.$$

and

(b)

$$f_X = F'_X \text{ is integrable on intervals } [s,t],\ s < t.$$

Then for any $b < x \in \mathbb{R}$

$$F_X(x) - F_X(b) = \int_b^x F'_X(t)dt, \quad x \in \mathbb{R}.$$

When $b \downarrow -\infty$, we get for $x \in \mathbb{R}$,

$$F_X(x) = \int_{-\infty}^x f_X(t)\ dt. \tag{4.1}$$

We remark that f_X is non-negative as the derivative of a non-decreasing function. Next, by applying Formula (4.1) to $+\infty$, we get that

$$1 = \int_{-\infty}^{+\infty} f_X(t)dt.$$

In summary, under our assumptions, there exists a function f_X satisfying

$$f_X(x) \geq 0, \text{for all } x \in \mathbb{R}, \tag{4.2}$$

and

$$\int_{-\infty}^{+\infty} f_X(t)dt, \tag{4.3}$$

We say that X is **an absolutely continuous** random variable and that f_X is its **probability density function** (*pdf*). This leas us to

the following definition.

Definition. A function $f : \mathbb{R} \to \mathbb{R}$ is a probability density function (*pdf*) if and only if Formulas (4.2) and (4.3) holds.

Definition. A *rrv* is said to have an absolutely continuous probability law if and only if there exists a *pdf* denoted f_X such that (4.1) holds.

The name of *absolutely continuity* is applied to the probability law and to the random variable itself and to the *cdf*.

Definition The **domain** or **support** of an absolutely continuous random variable is defined by

$$\mathcal{V}_X = \{x \in \mathbb{R}, f_X(x) \neq 0\}. \tag{4.4}$$

We saw that knowing the values set of a discrete *rvv* is very important for the computations. So is it for absolutely continuous *rvv*.

Examples. Let us return to the examples of the Exponential law and the uniform law. By deriving the **cdf**, we see that :

An exponential *rvv* with parameter $\lambda > 0$, $X \sim \mathcal{E}(\lambda)$, is absolutely continuous with *pdf*

$$f(x) = \lambda exp(-\lambda x) 1_{(x \geq 0)},$$

with support

$$\mathcal{V}_X = \mathbb{R}_+ = \{x \in \mathbb{R},\ x \geq 0\}.$$

A uniform (or uniformly distributed) random variable on $[a, b]$, $a < b$, $X \sim \mathcal{U}(a, b)$, is absolutely continuous with *pdf*

$$f(x) = \frac{1}{b-a} 1_{(a \leq x \leq b)},$$

and with domain

$$\mathcal{V}_X = [a, b].$$

4.2. Important classes of *pdf*'s.

In this subsection, we are going to present two important classes of distribution functions : the **Gamma** and the **Gaussian** classes. But we begin to show a general way of finding *pdf*'s.

I - A general way of finding *pdf*'s.

A general method of finding a *pdf* is to consider a non-negative function $g \geq 0$ which is integrable on $\mathbb{R}$ such that the integral on $\mathbb{R}$ is strictly positive, that is

$$C = \int_{\mathbb{R}} g(x)dx > 0.$$

We get a *pdf* $f \geq 0$ of the form

$$f(x) = C^{-1}\ g(x), x \in \mathbb{R}$$

Here are some examples.

II - Gamma Law $\gamma(a, b)$ with parameters $a > 0$ and $b > 0$.

(a) Definition. Let

$$\Gamma(a) = \int_0^{+\infty} x^{a-1}e^{-x}dx.$$

The function

$$f_{\gamma(a,b)}(x) = \frac{b^a}{\Gamma(a)}x^{a-1}e^{-bx}1_{(x\geq 0)}$$

is a *pdf*. A non-negative random variable X admitting $f_{\gamma(a,b)}$ as a pdf is said to follow a Gamma law $\gamma(a, b)$ with parameter $a > 0$ and $b > 0$, denoted $X \sim \gamma(a, b)$.

Important remark. An exponential $\mathcal{E}(\lambda)$ random variable, with $\lambda > 0$ is also a $\gamma(1, \lambda)$ *rrv*.

We have in Figure 2 graphical representations of probability density functions depending of the parameter λ. In Figure 3, probability density functions of γ laws are illustrated.



FIGURE 2. Exponential Probability Density Functions

Justification. From Calculus courses, we may justify that the following function

$$x^{a-1}e^{-bx}1_{(x>0)}$$

is integrable on its domain $\mathbb{R}_+$ and we denote

$$\Gamma(a,b) = \int_0^{+\infty} x^{a-1}e^{-bx}dx > 0. \tag{4.5}$$

We obtain a *pdf*

$$\frac{1}{\Gamma(a,b)}x^{a-1}e^{-bx}1_{(x>0)}.$$

If $b = 1$ in (4.5), we denote

$$\Gamma(a) = \Gamma(a,1) = \int_0^{+\infty} x^{a-1}e^{-x}dx.$$



FIGURE 3. γ-Probability Density Functions

The function $\Gamma(\circ)$ satisfies the relation

$$\forall (a > 0), \quad \Gamma(a) = (a-1)\Gamma(a-1). \tag{4.6}$$

This comes from the following partial integration

$$\begin{aligned} \Gamma(a) &= \int_0^{+\infty} x^{a-1} d(-e^{-x}) \\ &= \left[-x^{a-1}e^{-x}\right]_0^{+\infty} + (a-1)\int_0^{+\infty} x^{a-2}e^{-x}dx \\ &= 0 + (a-1)\Gamma(a-1). \end{aligned}$$

We also remark that

$$\Gamma(1) = 1, \tag{4.7}$$

since

$$\Gamma(1) = \int_0^{+\infty} e^{-x}dx = \int_0^{+\infty} d(-e^{-x}) = \left[-e^{-x}\right]_0^{+\infty} = 1.$$

So, by applying (4.6) to integers $a = n \in \mathbb{N}$, $n \geq 1$, and by taking (4.7) into account, we get by induction that

$$\forall (n \in \mathbb{N} \setminus \{0\}),\ \Gamma(n) = (n-1)!.$$

Finally, we have

$$\forall (a > 0, b > 0),\ \Gamma(a,b) = \frac{\Gamma(a)}{b^a}. \tag{4.8}$$

This comes from the change of variables $u = bx$ in (4.5) which gives

$$\begin{aligned} \Gamma(a,b) &= \int_0^{+\infty} \left(\frac{u}{b}\right)^{a-1} e^{-u} \left(\frac{du}{b}\right) \\ &= \frac{1}{b^a} \int_0^{+\infty} u^{a-1} e^{-u} du \\ &= \frac{\Gamma(a)}{b^a}. \end{aligned}$$

The proof is concluded by putting together (4.5), and (4.6), and (4.7), and (4.8).

III - Gaussian law $\mathcal{N}(m, \sigma^2)$ with parameters $m \in \mathbb{R}$ and $\sigma^2 > 0$.

(a) Definition. A random variable X admitting the *pdf*

$$f(x) = \frac{1}{\sigma\sqrt{2\pi}} \exp\left(-\frac{(x-m)^2}{2\sigma^2}\right), \quad x \in \mathbb{R}, \tag{4.9}$$

is said to follow a *normal* or a *Gaussian* law of parameters $m \in \mathbb{R}$ and $\sigma^2 > 0$, denoted by

$$X \sim \mathcal{N}(m, \sigma^2)$$

The probability density function of the standard Gaussian Normal variable is illustrated in Figure 4.

(b) Justification. The justification comes from the computation of

$$I = \int_{-\infty}^{+\infty} \exp\left(-\frac{(x-m)^2}{2\sigma^2}\right) dx.$$



FIGURE 4. Probability Density Function of a Standard Gaussian Random Variable

By the change of variable

$$u = \frac{x - m}{\sigma\sqrt{2}},$$

we get

$$I = \sigma\sqrt{2}\int_{-\infty}^{+\infty} e^{-u^2}du.$$

Advanced readers already know the value of I. Other readers, especially those in the first year of University, have to know that a forwarding Calculus course on multiple integration will show

$$\int_{-\infty}^{+\infty} e^{-u^2}du = \sqrt{\frac{\pi}{2}},$$

so that we arrive at

$$I = \sigma\sqrt{2\pi}.$$

This justifies that

$$\frac{1}{\sigma\sqrt{2\pi}}\exp\left(-\frac{(x-m)^2}{2\sigma^2}\right), x \in \mathbb{R},$$

is a *pdf*.

But in this chapter, we will provide elementary methods based on the earlier works of *de* Moivre (1732) and Laplace (1801) to directly proof that

$$J = \int_{-\infty}^{+\infty} \frac{1}{\sqrt{2\pi}}\exp\left(-t^2/2\right)\ dt = 1,$$

which proves that (4.9) is a *pdf* for $m = 0$ and $\sigma = 1$. For proving the general case of arbitrary m and $\sigma^2 > 0$, we can use the change of variable $u = (x-m)/\sigma$ to see that $I = J = 1$.

Commentary. This Gaussian law is one of the most important probability laws both in Probability Theory and in Statistics. It will be a key tool in the next courses on Probability Theory and Mathematical Statistics.

By now, we want to devoted a full section on some historical facts and exhibit the first central limit theorem through the *de* Moivre and Laplace theorems.

Warning. The reader is not obliged to read this section. The results of this section are available in modern books with elegant proofs. But, those who want acquire a deep expertise in this field are invited to read such a section because of its historical aspects. They are invited to discover the great works of former mathematicians.

5. The origins of the Gaussian law in the earlier Works of *de* Moivre and Laplace (1732 - 1801)

A very important example of absolutely continuous *cdf* is the Gaussian *rrv*. There are many ways to present it. Here, in this first course, we want to show the reader the very historical way to derive it from the Binomial law, through the *de* Moivre and Laplace theorems.

Here, the standard Gaussian law with $m = 0$ and $\sigma = 1$ is derived as an approximation of centered and normalized Binomial random variables.

Let $(X_n)_{n\geq 1}$ be a sequence of Bernoulli random variables of respective parameters n and p, that is, for each $n \geq 1$, $X_n \sim \mathcal{B}(n, p)$. We remind the following parameters of such *rrv*'s :

$$\mathbb{E}(X_n) = np \text{ and } Var(X_n) = npq.$$

Put

$$Z_n = \frac{X_n \ - \ np}{\sqrt{npq}}$$

We have $\mathbb{E}(Z_n) = 0$ and $Var(Z_n) = 1$. Here are historical results.

THEOREM 4. ***(de Moivre, 1732, see Loève,* [5]*, page 23)*** *.*

The equivalence

$$\mathbb{P}(X_n = j) \sim \frac{e^{-\frac{x^2}{2}}}{\sqrt{2^\pi npq}},$$

holds uniformly in

$$x = \frac{(j \ - \ np)}{\sqrt{2^\pi npq}} \in [a, \ b], a < b.$$

as $n \to \infty$.

Next, we have

THEOREM 5. *(Laplace 1801, see Loève* [5]*, page 23)* *.*

(1) For any $b < a$*, on a*

$$\mathbb{P}(b \leq Z_n \leq a) \to \int_b^a \frac{1}{\sqrt{2\pi}} \ e^{-\frac{x^2}{2}} dx.$$

(2) For any $x \in \mathbb{R}$*, on a*

$$\mathbb{P}(Z_n \leq x) \to \int_{-\infty}^x \frac{1}{\sqrt{2\pi}} \ e^{-\frac{x^2}{2}} dx.$$

(3) The function

$$\frac{1}{\sqrt{2\pi}} \ e^{-\frac{x^2}{2}} dx, \ x \in \mathbb{R},$$

is a probability distribution function.

Proofs of the results.

(A) Proof of Theorem 4.

At the beginning, let us remind some needed tools.

(i) $f_n(x) \to f(x)$ uniformly in $x \in A$, as $n \to \infty$, means that

$$\lim_{n\to\infty} \sup_{x\in A} |f_n(x) - f(x)| = 0.$$

(ii) $f_n(x) \sim f(x)$, as $n \to \infty$, for a fixed x, means

$$\lim_{n\to\infty} \frac{f_n(x)}{f(x)} = 1.$$

(iii) $f_n(x) \sim f(x)$ uniformly in $x \in A$, as $n \to \infty$, means that

$$\lim_{n\to\infty} \sup_{x\in A} \left| \left(\frac{f_n(x)}{f(x)} \right) - 1 \right| = 0.$$

(iv) $a_n = 0(b_n)$ as $n \to \infty$, means that

$$\exists \ M > 0, \ \exists \ N, \ \forall \, n \geq N, \ \left| \frac{a_n}{b_n} \right| < M.$$

(v) $a_n(x) = 0(b_n(x))$ uniformly in $x \in A$, as $n \to \infty$, means that

$$\exists \ M > 0, \ \exists \ N, \ \forall \, n \geq N, \ \forall \, x \in A, \ \left| \frac{a_n(x)}{b_n(x)} \right| < M.$$

(vi) We will need the Sterling Formula we studied in Chapter 1:

$$n! = \sqrt{2\pi n} \ n^n \ e^{-n} \ e^{\theta_n},$$

where for any $\eta > 0$, we have for n large enough,

$$|\theta_n| \leq \frac{1+\eta}{(12n)}.$$

We begin the proof by denoting $k = n - j$, $q = 1 - p$, and by writing

(5.1)

$$S_n(j) = \mathbb{P}(X_n = j) = \left(\frac{1}{\sqrt{2\pi}} \right) \sqrt{(\frac{n}{jk})} \left(\frac{np}{j} \right)^j \ \left(\frac{nq}{k} \right)^k \ e^{\theta_n} e^{-\theta_j} e^{-\theta_k}.$$

Hence

$$x = \frac{(j-np)}{\sqrt{2\pi npq}} \in [a,\ b] \Leftrightarrow np - a\sqrt{npq} \leq j \leq np - b\sqrt{npq} \tag{5.2}$$

$$\Leftrightarrow nq - b\sqrt{npq} \leq k \leq nq - a\sqrt{npq}. \tag{5.3}$$

Hence j and k tend to $+\infty$ uniformly in $x = \frac{(j-np)}{\sqrt{2\pi npq}} \in [a,\ b]$. Then $e^{-\theta_j} \sim 1$ et $e^{-\theta_k} \sim 1$, uniformly in $x = \frac{(j-np)}{\sqrt{2\pi npq}} \in [a,\ b]$ as $n \to \infty$. Let us use the following second order expansion of $\log(1+u)$:

$$\log(1+u) = u - \frac{1}{2}u^2 + O(u^3),\ \text{as } u \to 0. \tag{5.4}$$

Then, there exist a constant $C > 0$ et and a number $u_0 > 0$ such that

$$\forall (0 \leq u \leq u_0),\ \left|O(u^3)\right| \leq C\ u^3.$$

We have,

$$\frac{j}{(np)} = \left(1 + x\sqrt{\frac{q}{(np)}}\right)$$

$$\left|x\sqrt{\frac{q}{(np)}}\right| \leq \max(|a|, |b|)\sqrt{\frac{q}{(np)}} \to 0,$$

uniformly in $x \in [a,\ b]$. Combining this with (5.4) leads to

$$\left(\frac{np}{j}\right)^j = \exp\left(-\ j\ \log(\frac{j}{np})\right).$$

But we also have

$$\log\left(\frac{j}{np}\right) = \log\left(1 + x\sqrt{\frac{q}{(np)}}\right)$$

$$= x\sqrt{\frac{q}{(np)}} - x^2\ \frac{q}{[2(np)]} + O(n^{-\frac{1}{2}}). \tag{5.5}$$

We remark that the big O, which does not depend on n nor on x, is uniformly bounded. By using $j = np + x\sqrt{\frac{q}{(np)}}$ in (5.5), and by operating the product, we get

$$j\ \log\left(\frac{j}{np}\right) = x\sqrt{npq} + x^2\frac{q}{2} + 0(n^{-\frac{1}{2}})$$

and then,

$$\left(\frac{np}{j}\right)^{j} = \exp\left(\ - \ \sqrt{npq} - x^2\frac{q}{2} + 0(n^{-\frac{1}{2}})\right). \tag{5.6}$$

We just proved that

$$\left(\frac{np}{k}\right)^{j} = \exp\left(\ + \sqrt{npq} - x^2\frac{p}{2} + 0(n^{-\frac{1}{2}})\right). \tag{5.7}$$

The product gives

$$\left(\frac{np}{j}\right)^{j}\left(\frac{np}{k}\right)^{j} = \exp\left(\ - \frac{1}{2}x^2\right)\exp\left(\ 0(n^{-\frac{1}{2}})\right), \tag{5.8}$$

where the the big $0(n^{-\frac{1}{2}})$ uniformly holds in

$$x = \frac{(j \ - \ np)}{\sqrt{2^{\pi}npq}} \in [a, \ b], a < b.$$

The proof is finished by combining (5.8) and consequences of (5.2) and (5.3).

Proof of Theorem 5.

Let $j_0 = np + a\sqrt{npq}$. Let j_h, $h = 1, ..., m_{n-1}$, be the intergers between j_0 and $np + b\sqrt{npq} = j_{m_n}$ and denotet

$$x_h = \frac{(j_h - np)}{\sqrt{npq}}.$$

It is immediate that

$$\max_{0\leq h\leq m_{n-1}} \ j_{h+1} - j_h \leq \frac{1}{\sqrt{npq}}. \tag{5.9}$$

By the Laplace-Moivre-Gauss Theorem proba01.crv.LGM, we have

$$\mathbb{P}(X_n = j_h) = \frac{e^{\frac{-x_h^z}{2}}}{\sqrt{2\pi npq}}(1 + \varepsilon_n(h)), \ h = 1, ..., m_{n-1} \tag{5.10}$$

with

$$\max_{1\leq h\leq m_{n-1}} |\varepsilon_n(h)| = \varepsilon \to 0 \tag{5.11}$$

as $n \to 0$. But,

$$\mathbb{P}(a < Z_n < b) = \sum_{1\leq h\leq m_{n-1}} \mathbb{P}(X_n = j_h).$$

$$= \sum_{1\leq h\leq m_{n-1}} \frac{e^{\frac{-x_h^z}{2}}}{\sqrt{2\pi npq}} + \sum_{1\leq h\leq m_{n-1}} \frac{e^{\frac{-x_h^z}{2}}}{\sqrt{2\pi npq}}\ \varepsilon_n(h). \tag{5.12}$$

$$= \sum_{1\leq h\leq m_{n-1}} \frac{e^{\frac{-x_h^z}{2}}}{\sqrt{2\pi npq}}(1+\varepsilon_n(h))$$

Also, we have

$$\lim_{n\to\infty} \sum_{1\leq h\leq m_{n-1}} \frac{e^{\frac{-x_h^z}{2}}}{\sqrt{2\pi npq}} = \sum_{0\leq h\leq m_{n-1}} \frac{e^{\frac{-x_h^z}{2}}}{\sqrt{2\pi npq}}$$

since the two terms - that were added - converge to 0. The latter expression is a Riemann sum on $[a,\ b]$ based on a uniform subdivision and associated to the function $x \mapsto e^{-\frac{x^2}{2}}$. This function is continuous on $[a, b]$, and therefore, is integrable on $[a, b]$. Therefore the Riemann sums converge to the integral

$$\frac{1}{\sqrt{2\pi}} \int_a^b e^{-\frac{x^2}{2}} dx.$$

This means that the first term of (5.12) satisfies

$$\sum_{1\leq h\leq m_{n-1}} \frac{e^{\frac{-x_h^z}{2}}}{\sqrt{2^\pi npq}} \to \left(\frac{1}{\sqrt{2^\pi}}\right) \int_a^b e^{-\frac{x^2}{2}} dx. \tag{5.13}$$

The second term (5.12) satisfies

$$0 \leq \sum_{1\leq h\leq m_{n-1}} \frac{e^{-\frac{x_h^2}{2}}}{\sqrt{2^\pi npq}} \varepsilon_n(h) \leq \varepsilon_n \sum_{1\leq h\leq m_{n-1}} \frac{e^{-\frac{x_h^2}{2}}}{\sqrt{2^\pi npq}}. \tag{5.14}$$

Because of

$$\varepsilon_n = \sup\{|\varepsilon_n(h)|\,, 0 \leq h \leq m_n\} \to 0.$$

which tends to zero based on (5.11) above, and of (5.13), it comes that second term of (5.12) tends to zero. This establishes Point (1) of the theorem. Each of the signs $<$ and $>$ may be replaced $\leq$ or $\geq$. The effect in the proof would result in adding of at most two indices in the sequence $i_1, ..., i_{m_n-1}$ (j_0 and/or j_{m_n}) and the corresponding terms of

this or these two indices in (5.12) tend to zero and the result remains valid.

Let us move to the two other points. We have

$$\lim_{t\to\infty} t^2 e^{-\frac{t^2}{2}} = 0.$$

Thus, there exists $A > 0$ such that

$$|t| \geq A \Rightarrow 0 \leq e^{-\frac{t^2}{2}} < \frac{1}{t^2}. \tag{5.15}$$

Then, for $a > A$ and $b < -A$

$$\begin{aligned}
\int_b^a e^{-\frac{t^2}{2}} dt &\leq \int_{-A}^{A} e^{-\frac{t^2}{2}} dt + \int_b^{-A} e^{-\frac{t^2}{2}} dt + \int_A^a e^{-\frac{t^2}{2}} dt \\
&\leq \int_{-A}^{A} e^{-\frac{t^2}{2}} dt + \int_{-\infty}^{-A} e^{-\frac{t^2}{2}} dt + \int_A^{+\infty} e^{-\frac{t^2}{2}} dt \\
&\leq \int_{-A}^{A} e^{-\frac{t^2}{2}} dt + 2\int_A^{+\infty} e^{-\frac{t^2}{2}} dt \\
&\leq \int_{-A}^{A} e^{-\frac{t^2}{2}} dt + 2\int_A^{+\infty} \frac{1}{t^2} dt \quad \text{(By 5.15)} \\
&= \int_{-A}^{A} e^{-\frac{t^2}{2}} dt + \frac{2}{A}.
\end{aligned}$$

The inequality

$$\int_b^a e^{-\frac{t^2}{2}} dt \leq \int_{-A}^{A} e^{-\frac{t^2}{2}} dt + \frac{2}{A}, \tag{5.16}$$

remains true if $a \leq A$ or $b \geq -A$. Thus, Formula (5.16) holds for any real numbers a and b with $a < b$. Since

$$\int_b^a e^{-\frac{t^2}{2}} dt$$

is increasing as $a \uparrow \infty$ and $b \downarrow -\infty$, it comes from Calculus courses on limits, its limit as $a \to \infty$ and $b \to -\infty$, exists if and only if it is bounded. This is the case with 5.16. Then

$$\lim_{a\to\infty, b\to-\infty} \int_b^a e^{-\frac{t^2}{2}} dt = \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} e^{-\frac{t^2}{2}} dt \in \mathbb{R}$$

We denote

$$G(x) = \int_{-\infty}^{x} e^{-\frac{t^2}{2}} dt \in \mathbb{R}$$

and

$$F_n(x) = \mathbb{P}(Z_n \leq x), x \in \mathbb{R}.$$

It is clear that $G(x) \to 0$ as $x \to -\infty$. Thus, for any $\varepsilon > 0$, there exists $b_1 < 0$ such that

$$\forall\ b \leq b_1,\ G(b) \leq \frac{\varepsilon}{3}$$

For any $b < 0$, we apply the Markov's inequality, to have

$$\mathbb{P}(Z_n \leq b) \leq \mathbb{P}\left(|Z_n| \geq |b|\right) \leq \frac{\mathbb{E}\,|Z_n|^2}{|b|^2} = \frac{1}{|b|^2},$$

since, by the fact that $\mathbb{E}Z_n = 0$,

$$\mathbb{E}\,|Z_n|^2 = \mathbb{E}Z_n^2 = var(Z_n) = 1.$$

Then, for any $\varepsilon > 0$, there exist $b_2 < b_1$ such that

$$\forall\ b \leq b_2,\ F_n(b) = \mathbb{P}(Z_n \leq b) \leq \frac{\varepsilon}{3}$$

By *Point* (1), for any $a \in \mathbb{R}$, and for $b \leq \min(b_2, a)$, there exists n_0 such that for $n \geq n_0$,

$$|(F_n(a) - F_n(b)) - (G(a) - G(b))| \leq \frac{\varepsilon}{3}.$$

We combine the previous facts to get that for any $\varepsilon > 0$, for any $a \in \mathbb{R}$, there exists n_0 such that for $n \geq n_0$, ,

$$\begin{aligned} |F_n(a) - G(a)| &\leq |(F_n(a) - F_n(b_0)) - (G(a) - G(b_0))| + |F_n(b_0) - G(b_0)| \\ &\leq \frac{\varepsilon}{3} + |F_n(b_0)| + |G(b_0)| \leq \frac{\varepsilon}{3} + \frac{\varepsilon}{3} + \frac{\varepsilon}{3} = \varepsilon. \end{aligned}$$

We conclude that for any $a \in \mathbb{R}$,

$$\mathbb{P}(Z_n \leq a) \to G(a) = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2^\pi}} \int_{-\infty}^{a} e^{-\frac{t^2}{2}} dt.$$

This gives Point (2) of the theorem.

The last thing to do to close the proof is to show Point (3) by establishing that $G(\infty) = 1$. By the Markov's inequality and the remarks done above, we have for any $a > 0$,

$$\mathbb{P}(Z_n > a) \leq \mathbb{P}(|Z_n| > a) < \frac{1}{a^2}$$

Then for any $\varepsilon > 0$, there exists $a_0 > 0$ such that

$$\mathbb{P}(Z_n > a) < \varepsilon.$$

This is equivalent to say that there exists $a_0 > 0$ such that any $a \geq a_0$ and for ant $n \geq 1$,

$$1 - \varepsilon \leq F_n(a) \leq 1.$$

By letting $n \to \infty$ and by using Point (2), we get for any $a \geq a_0$,

$$1 - \varepsilon \leq G(a) \leq 1.$$

By the monotonicity of G, we have that $G(\infty)$ is the limit of $G(a)$ as $a \to \infty$. So, by letting $a \to \infty$ first and next $\varepsilon \downarrow 0$ in the last formula, we arrive at

$$1 = G(+\infty) = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2^\pi}} \int_{-\infty}^{+\infty} e^{-\frac{t^2}{2}} dt.$$

This is Point (3).

6. Numerical Probabilities

We need to make computations in solving problems based on probability theory. Especially, when we use the cumulative distribution functions F_X of some real-valued random, we need some time to find the numerical value of $F(x)$ for a specific value of x. Some time, we need to know the quantile function (to be defined in the next lines). Some decades ago, we were using probability tables, that you can find in earlier versions of many books on probability theory, even in some modern books.

Fortunately, we have now free and powerful software packages for probability and statistics computations. One of them is the software **R**. You may find at *www.r-project.org* the latest version of **R**. Such a software offer almost everything we need here.

Let us begin by the following problem.

Example. The final exam for a course, say of Geography, is composed by $n = 20$ Multiple Choice Questions (MCQ). For each equation, $k = 1$ answers are proposed and only of one them is true. The students are asked to answer to each question by choosing of the k proposed answers. At the end of the test, the grade of each student is the total number of correct answers. A student passes the exam if and only if he has at least the grade $x = 10$ over n.

One the students, say Jean, decides to answer at random. Let X be his possible grade before the exam. Here X follows a binomial law with parameters $n = 20$ and $p = 1/4$. So the probability he passes is

$$p_{pass} = \mathbb{P}(X \geq x) = \sum_{x \leq j \leq n} = \mathbb{P}(X = j).$$

We will give the solution as applications of the material we are going to present. We begin to introduce the quantile function.

A - Quantile function.

Let $F : \mathbb{R} \to [0, 1]$ be a cumulative distribution function. Since F is already non-decreasing, it is invertible if it is continuous and increasing. In that case, we may use the inverse function F^{-1}, defined by

$$\forall s \in [0, 1],\ \forall x \in \mathbb{R},\ F(x) = s \Leftrightarrow x = F^{-1}(s).$$

In the general case, we may also define the generalized inverse

$$\forall s \in [0,1],\ F^{-1}(s) = \inf\{x \in \mathbb{R},\ F(x) \leq s\}.$$

we have this property,

$$\forall s \in [0,1],\ \forall x \in \mathbb{R},\ F(x) = s \to F(F^{-1}(s) + 0) \leq s \leq F(F^{-1}(s)),$$

where

$$F(F^{-1}(s) + 0) = \lim_{h \downarrow 0} F(F^{-1}(s) + h).$$

The generalized inverse is called the quantile function of F. Remember that the quantile function is the inverse function of F if F is invertible.

B - Installation of R.

Once you have installed **R** on your computer, and you launched, you will see the window given in Figure 6. You will write your command and press the ENTER button of your keyboard. The result of the graph is display automatically.



Distribution	R name	additional arguments
beta	beta	shape1, shape2, ncp
binomial	binom	size, prob
Cauchy	cauchy	location, scale
chi-squared	chisq	df, ncp
exponential	exp	rate
F	f	df1, df2, ncp
gamma	gamma	shape, scale
geometric	geom	prob
hypergeometric	hyper	m, n, k
log-normal	lnorm	meanlog, sdlog
logistic	logis	location, scale
negative binomial	nbinom	size, prob
normal	norm	mean, sd
Poisson	pois	lambda
Students t	t	df, ncp
uniform	unif	min, max
Weibull	weibull	shape, scale
Wilcoxon	wilcox	m, n

C - Numerical probabilities in R.

In R, each probability law has its name. Here are the most common ones in Table

How to use each probability law?

of **name** is the name of the probability law (second column) and has for example 3 parameters param1, param2 and param3 :

(a) Add the letter **p** before the name to have the cumulative distribution function, that is called as follows :

$$pname(x, param1, param2, param3).$$

(b) Add the letter **d** before the name to have the probability density function (discrete or absolutely continuous), that is called as follows :

$$dname(x, param1, param2, param3).$$

(c) Add the letter **q** before the name to have the quantile function, that is called as follows

$$qname(x, param1, param2, param3).$$



Example. Let us use the Normal Random variable or parameter : mean ($m = 0$) and variance ($\sigma = 1$).

For $X \sim \mathcal{N}(0, 1)$, we computed

$$p = \mathbb{P}(X \leq 1.96)$$

We may read in Figure 6 the value : $p = 0.975$.

We may do more and get more values in Table 6.

Probability	argument	R command	values
$\mathbb{P}(X \leq -2)$	-2	pnorm(-2,0,1)	0.02275013
$\mathbb{P}(X \leq -1.95)$	-1.96	pnorm(-1.96,0,1)	0.02499790
$\mathbb{P}(X \leq -0.8)$	-0.8	pnorm(-0.8,0,1)	0.02275013
$\mathbb{P}(X \leq 0)$	0	pnorm(0,0,1)	0.5
$\mathbb{P}(X \leq 0.8)$	0.8	pnorm(0.2,0,1)	0.02275013
$\mathbb{P}(X \leq -1.96)$	1.96	pnorm(1.96,0,1)	0.975
$\mathbb{P}(X \leq 2)$	2	pnorm(2,0,1)	0.02275013

Exercise. Use the quantile function to the probabilities to find the arguments. For example, set $u = 0.02275013$, and use the **R** command

$$qnorm(u, 0, 1)$$

to find again $x = -2$.

Follow that example to learn how to use all the probability law. Now, we are return back to our binomial example.

D - Solution of the Lazy student problem using R.

We already knew that the probability that he passes by answering at random is

$$p_{pass} = \mathbb{P}(X \geq x) = \sum_{x \leq j \leq n} = \mathbb{P}(X = j).$$

The particular values are : $n = 20$, $p = 0.25$, $x = 10$. From Table 6, we see that the **R** name for the binomial probability name is *binom* and its parameters are $n = size$ and $prob = p$. By using **R**, this probability is

$$p_{pass} = \mathbb{P}(X \geq 10) = 1 - \mathbb{P}(X \leq 10) = 1 - pbinom(9, 20, 0.25) = 0.01386442.$$

So, he has only 13 chances over one thousand to pass.

CHAPTER 8

Appendix : Elements of Calculus

1. Review on limits in $\overline{\mathbb{R}}$. What should not be ignored on limits.

Calculus is fundamental to Probability Theory and Statistics. Especially, the notions on limits on $\mathbb{R}$ are extremely important. The current section allows to the reader not revise these notions and to complete his knowledge on this subject through exercises whose solutions are given in details.

Definition $\ell \in \overline{\mathbb{R}}$ is an accumulation point of a sequence $(x_n)_{n\geq 0}$ of real numbers finite or infinite, in $\overline{\mathbb{R}}$, if and only if there exists a sub sequence $(x_{n(k)})_{k\geq 0}$ of $(x_n)_{n\geq 0}$ such that $x_{n(k)}$ converges to ℓ, as $k \to +\infty$.

Fact 1 : Set $y_n = \inf_{p\geq n} x_p$ and $z_n = \sup_{p\geq n} x_p$ for all $n \geq 0$. Show that :

(1) $\forall n \geq 0, y_n \leq x_n \leq z_n$

(2) Justify the existence of the limit of y_n called limit inferior of the sequence $(x_n)_{n\geq 0}$, denoted by $\liminf x_n$ or $\underline{\lim}\ x_n$, and that it is equal to the following

$$\underline{\lim}\ x_n = \liminf x_n = \sup_{n\geq 0} \inf_{p\geq n} x_p$$

(3) Justify the existence of the limit of z_n called limit superior of the sequence $(x_n)_{n\geq 0}$ denoted by $\limsup x_n$ or $\overline{\lim}\ x_n$, and that it is equal

$$\overline{\lim}\ x_n = \limsup x_n = \inf_{n\geq 0} \sup_{p\geq n} x_p x_p$$

(4) Establish that

$$-\liminf x_n = \limsup(-x_n) \quad \text{and} \quad -\limsup x_n = \liminf(-x_n).$$

(5) Show that the limit superior is sub-additive and the limit inferior is super-additive, i.e. : for two sequences $(s_n)_{n\geq 0}$ and $(t_n)_{n\geq 0}$

$$\limsup(s_n + t_n) \leq \limsup s_n + \limsup t_n$$

and

$$\liminf(s_n + t_n) \leq \liminf s_n + \liminf t_n$$

(6) Deduce from (1) that if

$$\liminf x_n = \limsup x_n,$$

then $(x_n)_{n\geq 0}$ has a limit and

$$\lim x_n = \liminf x_n = \limsup x_n$$

Exercise 2. Accumulation points of $(x_n)_{n\geq 0}$.

(a) Show that if ℓ_1=$\liminf x_n$ and $\ell_2 = \limsup x_n$ are accumulation points of $(x_n)_{n\geq 0}$. Show one case and deduce the second using point (3) of exercise 1.

(b) Show that ℓ_1 is the smallest accumulation point of $(x_n)_{n\geq 0}$ and ℓ_2 is the biggest. (Similarly, show one case and deduce the second using point (3) of exercise 1).

(c) Deduce from (a) that if $(x_n)_{n\geq 0}$ has a limit ℓ, then it is equal to the unique accumulation point and so,

$$\ell = \overline{\lim}\ x_n = \limsup x_n = \inf_{n\geq 0} \sup_{p\geq n} x_p.$$

(d) Combine this this result with point **(6)** of Exercise 1 to show that a sequence $(x_n)_{n\geq 0}$ of $\overline{\mathbb{R}}$ has a limit ℓ in $\overline{\mathbb{R}}$ if and only if $\liminf x_n = \limsup x_n$ and then

$$\ell = \lim x_n = \liminf x_n = \limsup x_n$$

Exercise 3. Let $(x_n)_{n\geq 0}$ be a non-decreasing sequence of $\overline{\mathbb{R}}$. Study its limit superior and its limit inferior and deduce that

$$\lim x_n = \sup_{n\geq 0} x_n.$$

Dedude that for a non-increasing sequence $(x_n)_{n\geq 0}$ of $\overline{\mathbb{R}}$,

$$\lim x_n = \inf_{n\geq 0} x_n.$$

Exercise 4. (Convergence criteria)

Criterion 1. Let $(x_n)_{n\geq 0}$ be a sequence of $\overline{\mathbb{R}}$ and a real number $\ell \in \overline{\mathbb{R}}$ such that: Every subsequence of $(x_n)_{n\geq 0}$ also has a subsequence (that is a subssubsequence of $(x_n)_{n\geq 0}$) that converges to ℓ. Then, the limit of $(x_n)_{n\geq 0}$ exists and is equal ℓ.

Criterion 2. Upcrossings and downcrossings.

Let $(x_n)_{n\geq 0}$ be a sequence in $\overline{\mathbb{R}}$ and two real numbers a and b such that $a < b$. We define

$$\nu_1 = \begin{cases} \inf & \{n \geq 0, x_n < a\} \\ +\infty & \text{if } (\forall n \geq 0, x_n \geq a) \end{cases}.$$

If ν_1 is finite, let

$$\nu_2 = \begin{cases} \inf & \{n > \nu_1, x_n > b\} \\ +\infty & \text{if } (n > \nu_1, x_n \leq b) \end{cases}.$$

.

As long as the $\nu_j's$ are finite, we can define for $\nu_{2k-2} (k \geq 2)$

$$\nu_{2k-1} = \begin{cases} \inf & \{n > \nu_{2k-2}, x_n < a\} \\ +\infty & \text{if } (\forall n > \nu_{2k-2}, x_n \geq a) \end{cases}.$$

and for ν_{2k-1} finite,

$$\nu_{2k} = \begin{cases} \inf & \{n > \nu_{2k-1}, x_n > b\} \\ +\infty & \text{if } (n > \nu_{2k-1}, x_n \leq b) \end{cases}.$$

We stop once one ν_j is $+\infty$. If ν_{2j} is finite, then

$$x_{\nu_{2j}} - x_{\nu_{2j-1}} > b - a.$$

We then say : by that moving from $x_{\nu_{2j-1}}$ to $x_{\nu_{2j}}$, we have accomplished a crossing (toward the up) of the segment $[a, b]$ called *up-crossings*. Similarly, if one ν_{2j+1} is finite, then the segment $[x_{\nu_{2j}}, x_{\nu_{2j+1}}]$ is a crossing downward (downcrossing) of the segment $[a, b]$. Let

$D(a, b) =$ number of upcrossings of the sequence of the segment $[a, b]$.

(a) What is the value of $D(a,b)$ if ν_{2k} is finite and ν_{2k+1} infinite.

(b) What is the value of $D(a,b)$ if ν_{2k+1} is finite and ν_{2k+2} infinite.

(c) What is the value of $D(a,b)$ if all the $\nu_j's$ are finite.

(d) Show that $(x_n)_{n\geq 0}$ has a limit iff for all $a<b$, $D(a,b)<\infty$.

(e) Show that $(x_n)_{n\geq 0}$ has a limit iff for all $a<b$, $(a,b)\in\mathbb{Q}^2$, $D(a,b)<\infty$.

Exercise 5. (Cauchy Criterion). Let $(x_n)_{n\geq 0}$ $\mathbb{R}$ be a sequence of (**real numbers**).

(a) Show that if $(x_n)_{n\geq 0}$ is Cauchy, then it has a unique accumulation point $\ell\in\mathbb{R}$ which is its limit.

(b) Show that if a sequence $(x_n)_{n\geq 0}\subset\mathbb{R}$ converges to $\ell\in\mathbb{R}$, then, it is Cauchy.

(c) Deduce the Cauchy criterion for sequences of real numbers.

SOLUTIONS

Exercise 1.

Question (1) :. It is obvious that :

$$\inf_{p\geq n} x_p \leq x_n \leq \sup_{p\geq n} x_p,$$

since x_n is an element of $\{x_n, x_{n+1}, ...\}$ on which we take the supremum or the infinimum.

Question (2) :. Let $y_n = \inf_{p\geq 0} x_p = \inf_{p\geq n} A_n$, where $A_n = \{x_n, x_{n+1}, ...\}$ is a non-increasing sequence of sets : $\forall n \geq 0$,

$$A_{n+1} \subset A_n.$$

So the infinimum on A_n increases. If y_n increases in $\overline{\mathbb{R}}$, its limit is its upper bound, finite or infinite. So

$$y_n \nearrow \underline{\lim}\ x_n,$$

is a finite or infinite number.

Question (3) :. We also show that $z_n = \sup A_n$ decreases and $z_n \downarrow \overline{\lim}\ x_n$.

Question (4) :. We recall that

$$-\sup\{x, x \in A\} = \inf\{-x, x \in A\}.$$

Which we write

$$-\sup A = \inf -A.$$

Thus,

$$-z_n = -\sup A_n = \inf -A_n = \inf\{-x_p, p \geq n\}..$$

The right hand term tends to $-\overline{\lim}\ x_n$ and the left hand to $\underline{\lim}\ -x_n$ and so

$$-\overline{\lim}\ x_n = \underline{\lim}\ (-x_n).$$

Similarly, we show:

$$-\underline{\lim}\ (x_n) = \overline{\lim}\ (-x_n).$$

Question (5). These properties come from the formulas, where $A \subseteq \mathbb{R}, B \subseteq \mathbb{R}$:

$$\sup\{x + y, A \subseteq \mathbb{R}, B \subseteq \mathbb{R}\} \leq \sup A + \sup B.$$

In fact :

$$\forall x \in \mathbb{R}, x \leq \sup A$$

and

$$\forall y \in \mathbb{R}, y \leq \sup B.$$

Thus

$$x + y \leq \sup A + \sup B,$$

where

$$\sup_{x \in A, y \in B} x + y \leq \sup A + \sup B.$$

Similarly,

$$\inf(A + B \geq \inf A + \inf B.$$

In fact :

$$\forall (x, y) \in A \times B, x \geq \inf A \text{ and } y \geq \inf B.$$

Thus

$$x + y \geq \inf A + \inf B.$$

Thus

$$\inf_{x \in A, y \in B}(x + y) \geq \inf A + \inf B$$

Application.

$$\sup_{p \geq n} (x_p + y_p) \leq \sup_{p \geq n} x_p + \sup_{p \geq n} y_p.$$

All these sequences are non-increasing. Taking infimum, we obtain the limits superior :

$$\overline{\lim}\ (x_n + y_n) \leq \overline{\lim}\ x_n + \overline{\lim}\ x_n.$$

Question (6) : Set

$$\underline{\lim}\ x_n = \overline{\lim}\ x_n,$$

Since :

$$\forall x \geq 1,\ y_n \leq x_n \leq z_n,$$

$$y_n \to \underline{\lim}\ x_n$$

and

$$z_n \to \overline{\lim}\ x_n,$$

we apply Sandwich Theorem to conclude that the limit of x_n exists and :

$$\lim\ x_n = \underline{\lim}\ x_n = \overline{\lim}\ x_n.$$

Exercice 2.

Question (a).

Thanks to question (4) of exercise 1, it suffices to show this property for one of the limits. Consider the limit superior and the three cases:

The case of a finite limit superior :

$$\underline{\lim}\ x_n = \ell \text{ finite.}$$

By definition,

$$z_n = \sup_{p\geq n} x_p \downarrow \ell.$$

So:

$$\forall \varepsilon > 0, \exists (N(\varepsilon) \geq 1), \forall p \geq N(\varepsilon), \ell - \varepsilon < x_p \leq \ell + \varepsilon.$$

Take less than that:

$$\forall \varepsilon > 0, \exists n_\varepsilon \geq 1 : \ell - \varepsilon < x_{n_\varepsilon} \leq \ell + \varepsilon.$$

We shall construct a subsequence converging to ℓ.

Let $\varepsilon = 1$:

$$\exists N_1 : \ell - 1 < x_{N_1} = \sup_{p\geq n} x_p \leq \ell + 1.$$

But if

$$z_{N_1} = \sup_{p\geq n} x_p > \ell - 1, \tag{1.1}$$

there surely exists an $n_1 \geq N_1$ such that

$$x_{n_1} > \ell - 1.$$

if not we would have

$$(\forall p \geq N_1, x_p \leq \ell - 1\ ) \Longrightarrow \sup\{x_p, p \geq N_1\} = z_{N_1} \geq \ell - 1,$$

which is contradictory with (1.1). So, there exists $n_1 \geq N_1$ such that

$$\ell - 1 < x_{n_1} \leq \sup_{p\geq N_1} x_p \leq \ell - 1.$$

i.e.

$$\ell - 1 < x_{n_1} \leq \ell + 1.$$

We move to step $\varepsilon = \frac{1}{2}$ and we consider the sequence$(z_n)_{n\geq n_1}$ whose limit remains ℓ. So, there exists $N_2 > n_1$:

$$\ell - \frac{1}{2} < z_{N_2} \leq \ell - \frac{1}{2}.$$

We deduce like previously that $n_2 \geq N_2$ such that

$$\ell - \frac{1}{2} < x_{n_2} \leq \ell + \frac{1}{2}$$

with $n_2 \geq N_1 > n_1$.

Next, we set $\varepsilon = 1/3$, there will exist $N_3 > n_2$ such that

$$\ell - \frac{1}{3} < z_{N_3} \leq \ell - \frac{1}{3}$$

and we could find an $n_3 \geq N_3$ such that

$$\ell - \frac{1}{3} < x_{n_3} \leq \ell - \frac{1}{3}.$$

Step by step, we deduce the existence of $x_{n_1}, x_{n_2}, x_{n_3}, ..., x_{n_k}, ...$ with $n_1 < n_2 < n_3 < ... < n_k < n_{k+1} < ...$ such that

$$\forall k \geq 1, \ell - \frac{1}{k} < x_{n_k} \leq \ell - \frac{1}{k},$$

i.e.

$$|\ell - x_{n_k}| \leq \frac{1}{k}.$$

Which will imply:

$$x_{n_k} \to \ell$$

Conclusion : $(x_{n_k})_{k\geq 1}$ is very well a subsequence since $n_k < n_{k+1}$ for all $k \geq 1$ and it converges to ℓ, which is then an accumulation point.

Case of the limit superior equal $+\infty$:

$$\overline{\lim}\ x_n = +\infty.$$

Since $z_n \uparrow +\infty$, we have : $\forall k \geq 1, \exists N_k \geq 1$,

$$z_{N_k} \geq k + 1.$$

For $k = 1$, let $z_{N_1} = \inf_{p\geq N_1} x_p \geq 1 + 1 = 2$. So there exists

$$n_1 \geq N_1$$

such that :

$$x_{n_1} \geq 1.$$

For $k = 2$: consider the sequence $(z_n)_{n\geq n_1+1}$. We find in the same manner

$$n_2 \geq n_1 + 1$$

and

$$x_{n_2} \geq 2.$$

Step by step, we find for all $k \geq 3$, an $n_k \geq n_{k-1} + 1$ such that

$$x_{n_k} \geq k.$$

Which leads to $x_{n_k} \to +\infty$ as $k \to +\infty$.

Case of the limit superior equal $-\infty$:

$$\overline{\lim} x_n = -\infty.$$

This implies : $\forall k \geq 1, \exists N_k \geq 1$, such that

$$z_{n_k} \leq -k.$$

For $k = 1, \exists n_1$ such that

$$z_{n_1} \leq -1.$$

But

$$x_{n_1} \leq z_{n_1} \leq -1$$

Let $k = 2$. Consider $(z_n)_{n\geq n_1+1} \downarrow -\infty$. There will exist $n_2 \geq n_1 + 1$:

$$x_{n_2} \leq z_{n_2} \leq -2$$

Step by step, we find $n_{k1} < n_{k+1}$ in such a way that $x_{n_k} < -k$ for all k bigger that 1. So

$$x_{n_k} \to +\infty$$

Question (b).

Let ℓ be an accumulation point of $(x_n)_{n\geq 1}$, the limit of one of its subsequences $(x_{n_k})_{k\geq 1}$. We have

$$y_{n_k} = \inf_{p\geq n_k} x_p \leq x_{n_k} \leq \sup_{p\geq n_k} x_p = z_{n_k}$$

The left hand side term is a subsequence of (y_n) tending to the limit inferior and the right hand side is a subsequence of (z_n) tending to the limit superior. So we will have:

$$\underline{\lim}\ x_n \leq \ell \leq \overline{\lim}\ x_n,$$

which shows that $\underline{\lim}\ x_n$ is the smallest accumulation point and $\overline{\lim}\ x_n$ is the largest.

Question (c). If the sequence $(x_n)_{n\geq 1}$ has a limit ℓ, it is the limit of all its subsequences, so subsequences tending to the limits superior and inferior. Which answers question (b).

Question (d). We answer this question by combining point (d) of this exercise and point (**6**) of the exercise **1**.

Exercise 3. Let $(x_n)_{n\geq 0}$ be a non-decreasing sequence, we have:

$$z_n = \sup_{p\geq n} x_p = \sup_{p\geq 0} x_p, \forall n \geq 0.$$

Why? Because by increasingness,

$$\{x_p, p \geq 0\} = \{x_p, 0 \leq p \leq n-1\} \cup \{x_p, p \geq n\}$$

Since all the elements of $\{x_p, 0 \leq p \leq n-1\}$ are smaller than that of $\{x_p, p \geq n\}$, the supremum is achieved on $\{x_p, p \geq n\}$ and so

$$\ell = \sup_{p\geq 0} x_p = \sup_{p\geq n} x_p = z_n$$

Thus

$$z_n = \ell \to \ell.$$

We also have $y_n = \inf\{x_p, 0 \leq p \leq n\} = x_n$ which is a non-decreasing sequence and so converges to $\ell = \sup_{p\geq 0} x_p$.

Exercise 4.

Let $\ell \in \overline{\mathbb{R}}$ having the indicated property. Let ℓ' be a given accumulation point.

$$(x_{n_k})_{k\geq 1} \subseteq (x_n)_{n\geq 0} \text{ such that } x_{n_K} \to \ell'.$$

By hypothesis this subsequence (x_{n_K}) has in turn a subsubsequence $\left(x_{n_{(k(p))}}\right)_{p\geq 1}$ such that $x_{n_{(k(p))}} \to \ell$ as $p \to +\infty$.

But as a subsequence of $\left(x_{n_{(k)}}\right)$,

$$x_{n_{(k(\ell))}} \to \ell'.$$

Thus

$$\ell = \ell'.$$

Applying that to the limit superior and limit inferior, we have:

$$\overline{\lim}\ x_n = \underline{\lim}\ x_n = \ell.$$

And so $\lim x_n$ exists and equals ℓ.

Exercise 5.

Question (a). If ν_{2k} finite and ν_{2k+1} infinite, it then has exactly k up-crossings : $[x_{\nu_{2j-1}}, x_{\nu_{2j}}]$, $j = 1, ..., k$: $D(a, b) = k$.

Question (b). If ν_{2k+1} finite and ν_{2k+2} infinite, it then has exactly k up-crossings: $[x_{\nu_{2j-1}}, x_{\nu_{2j}}]$, $j = 1, ..., k$: $D(a, b) = k$.

Question (c). If all the $\nu_j's$ are finite, then, there are an infinite number of up-crossings : $[x_{\nu_{2j-1}}, x_{\nu_{2j}}]$, $j \geq 1k$: $D(a, b) = +\infty$.

Question (d). Suppose that there exist $a < b$ rationals such that $D(a, b) = +\infty$. Then all the $\nu_j's$ are finite. The subsequence $x_{\nu_{2j-1}}$ is strictly below a. So its limit inferior is below a. This limit inferior is an accumulation point of the sequence $(x_n)_{n\geq 1}$, so is more than $\underline{\lim}\ x_n$, which is below a.

Similarly, the subsequence $x_{\nu_{2j}}$ is strictly below b. So the limit superior is above a. This limit superior is an accumulation point of the sequence $(x_n)_{n\geq 1}$, so it is below $\overline{\lim}\ x_n$, which is directly above b. Which leads to:

$$\underline{\lim}\ x_n \leq a < b \leq \overline{\lim}\ x_n.$$

That implies that the limit of (x_n) does not exist. In contrary, we just proved that the limit of (x_n) exists, meanwhile for all the real numbers a and b such that $a < b$, $D(a, b)$ is finite.

Now, suppose that the limit of (x_n) does not exist. Then,

$$\underline{\lim}\ x_n < \overline{\lim}\ x_n.$$

We can then find two rationals a and b such that $a < b$ and a number ϵ such that $0 < \epsilon$, all the

$$\underline{\lim}\ x_n < a - \epsilon < a < b < b + \epsilon < \overline{\lim}\ x_n.$$

If $\underline{\lim}\ x_n < a - \epsilon$, we can return to question **(a)** of exercise **2** and construct a subsequence of (x_n) which tends to $\underline{\lim}\ x_n$ while remaining below $a-\epsilon$. Similarly, if $b+\epsilon < \overline{\lim}\ x_n$, we can create a subsequence of (x_n) which tends to $\overline{\lim}\ x_n$ while staying above $b+\epsilon$. It is evident with these two sequences that we could define with these two sequences all

ν_j finite and so $D(a,b) = +\infty$.

We have just shown by contradiction that if all the $D(a,b)$ are finite for all rationals a and b such that $a < b$, then, the limit of $(x)n)$ exists.

Exercise 5. Cauchy criterion in $\mathbb{R}$.

Suppose that the sequence is Cauchy, *i.e.*,

$$\lim_{(p,q)\to(+\infty,+\infty)} (x_p - x_q) = 0.$$

Then let $x_{n_{k,1}}$ and $x_{n_{k,2}}$ be two subsequences converging respectively to $\ell_1 = \underline{\lim}\ x_n$ and $\ell_2 = \overline{\lim}\ x_n$. So

$$\lim_{(p,q)\to(+\infty,+\infty)} (x_{n_{p,1}} - x_{n_{q,2}}) = 0.$$

, By first letting $p \to +\infty$, we have

$$\lim_{q\to+\infty} \ell_1 - x_{n_{q,2}} = 0.$$

Which shows that ℓ_1 is finite, else $\ell_1 - x_{n_{q,2}}$ would remain infinite and would not tend to 0. By interchanging the roles of p and q, we also have that ℓ_2 is finite.

Finally, by letting $q \to +\infty$, in the last equation, we obtain

$$\ell_1 = \underline{\lim}\ x_n = \overline{\lim}\ x_n = \ell_2.$$

which proves the existence of the finite limit of the sequence (x_n).

Now suppose that the finite limit ℓ of (x_n) exists. Then

$$\lim_{(p,q)\to(+\infty,+\infty)} (x_p - x_q) = \ell - \ell = 0.$$

0 Which shows that the sequence is Cauchy.

Bravo! Grab this knowledge. Limits in $\overline{\mathbb{R}}$ have no more secrets for you!.

2. Convex functions

Convex functions play an important role in real analysis, and in probability theory in particular.

A convex function is defined as follows.

A - Definition. A real-valued function $g : I \longrightarrow \mathbb{R}$ defined on an interval on $\mathbb{R}$ is convex if and only if, for any $0 < \alpha < 1$, for any $(x, y) \in I^2$, we have

$$g(\alpha x + (1 - \alpha)) \leq \alpha g(x) + (1 - \alpha)g(y). \tag{2.1}$$

The first important thing to know is that a convex function is continuous.

B - A convex function is continuous.

Actually, we have more.

PROPOSITION 3. *If $g : I \longrightarrow \mathbb{R}$ is convex on the interval I, then g admits a right-derivative and a left-derivative at each point of I. In particuler, g is continuous on I.*

Proof. In this proof, we take $I = \mathbb{R}$, which is the most general case. Suppose that g is convex. We begin to prove this formula :

$$\forall s < t < u, \frac{X(t) - X(s)}{t - s} \leq \frac{X(u) - X(s)}{u - s} \leq \frac{X(u) - X(t)}{u - t} (FCC1)$$

Check that, for $s < t < u$, we have

$$t = \frac{u - t}{u - s}s + \frac{t - s}{u - s}u = \lambda s + (1 - \lambda)t,$$

where $\lambda = (u - t)/(u - s) \in]0, 1[$ and $1 - \lambda = (t - s)/(u - s)$. By convexity, we have

$$X(t) \leq \frac{u - t}{u - s}X(s) + \frac{t - s}{u - s}X(u) \text{ (FC1) .}$$

Let us multiply all members of (FC1) by $(u - s)$ to get

$$(u - s)X(t) \leq (u - t)X(s) + (t - s)X(u) \text{ (FC1) .}$$

First, we split $(u-t)$ into $(u-t)=(u-s)-(t-s)$ in the first term in the left-hand member to have

$$\begin{aligned} & (u-s)X(t) \leq (u-s)X(s) - (t-s)X(s) + (t-s)X(u) \\ \Rightarrow \quad & (u-s)(X(t)-X(s)) \leq (t-s)(X(s)-X(u)). \end{aligned}$$

This leads to

$$\frac{X(t)-X(s)}{t-s} \leq \frac{X(u)-X(s)}{u-s} \text{ (FC2a) .}$$

Next, we split $(t-s)$ into $(t-s)=(u-s)-(u-t)$ in the second term in the left-hand member to have

$$\begin{aligned} & (u-s)X(t) \leq (u-t)X(s) + (u-s)X(u) - (u-t)X(u) \\ \Rightarrow \quad & (u-s)(X(t)-X(u)) \leq (u-t)(X(s)-X(u)). \end{aligned}$$

Let us multiply the last inequality by -1 to get

$$(u-s)(X(u)-X(t)) \geq (u-t)(X(u)-X(s))$$

and then

$$\frac{X(u)-X(s)}{u-s} \leq \frac{X(u)-X(t)}{u-t} \text{ (FC2b)}$$

Together (FC2a) and (FC2b) prove (FCC).

Let us write (FCC) in the following form

$$\forall t_1 < t_2 < t_3, \frac{X(t_2)-X(t_1)}{t_2-t_1} \leq \frac{X(t_3)-X(t_1)}{t_3-t_1} \leq \frac{X(t_3)-X(t_2)}{t_3-t_2} (FCC2)$$

We also may apply (FCC) to get :

$$\forall r < s < t, \frac{X(s)-X(r)}{r-s} \leq \frac{X(s)-X(r)}{s-r} \leq \frac{X(t)-X(s)}{s-t} (FCC)$$

We are on the point to conclude. Fix $r < s$. From (FFC1), we may see that the function

$$G(v) = \frac{X(v) - X(t)}{v - t}, v > t,$$

is increasing since in (FCC1), $G(t) \leq G(u)$ for $t < u$. By (FCC2), $G(v)$ is bounded below by $G(r)$ (that is fixed with r and t).

We conclude $G(v)$ decreases to a real number as $v \downarrow t$ and this limit is the right-derivative of X at t :

$$\lim_{v \downarrow t} \frac{X(v) - X(t)}{v - t} = X'_r(t) \text{ (RL)}$$

Since X has a right-derivative at each point, it is right-continuous at each point since, by (RL),

$$X(t + h) - X(t) = h(G(t + h) = h(X'_r(t)) + o(1)) \quad as \quad h \to 0.$$

Extension. To prove that the left-derivative exists, we use a very similar way. We conclude that X is left-continuous and finally, X is continuous.□

C - A weakened definition.

LEMMA 4. *If $g : I \longrightarrow \mathbb{R}$ is continuous, g is convex whenever we have for any $(x, y) \in I^2$,*

$$g\left(\frac{x + y}{2}\right) \leq \frac{g(x) + g(y)}{2}.$$

So, for a continuous function, we may only check the condition of convexity (2.1) for $\alpha = 1/2$.

Proof of Lemma 4.

□

Finally, we are going to give generalization of Formula (2.1) to more than two terms.

D - General Formula of Convexity.

D1 - A convexity formula with an arbitrary finite number of points.

Let g be convex and let $k \geq 2$. Then for any α_i, $0 < \alpha_i < 1$, $1 \leq i \leq k$ such that

$$\alpha_1 + ... + \alpha_k = 1$$

and for any $(x_1, ..., x_k) \in I^k$, we have

$$g(\alpha_1 x_1 + ... + \alpha_k x_k) \leq \alpha_1 g(x_1) + ... + \alpha_k g(x_k). \tag{2.2}$$

Proof. Let us use an induction argument. The formula is true for $k = 2$ by definition. Let us assume it is true for up to k. And we have to prove it is true for $k+1$. Set α_i, $0 < \alpha_i < 1$, $1 \leq i \leq k+1$ such that

$$\alpha_1 + ... + \alpha_k + \alpha_{k+1} = 1$$

and let $(x_1, ..., x_k, x_k) \in I^{k+1}$. By denoting

$$\beta_{k+1} = \alpha_1 + ... + \alpha_k$$
$$\alpha_i^* = \alpha_i / \beta_{k+1}, 1 \leq i \leq k,$$

and

$$y_{k+1} = \alpha_1^* x_1 + ... + \alpha_k^* x_k,$$

we have

$$\begin{aligned} g(\alpha_1 x_1 + ... + \alpha_k x_k + \alpha_{k+1} x_{k+1}) &= g\left((\alpha_1 + ... + \alpha_k)(\alpha_1^* x_1 + ... + \alpha_k^* x_k) + \alpha_{k+1} x_{k+1})\right) \\ &= g\left(\beta_{k+1} y_{k+1} + \alpha_{k+1} x_{k+1})\right). \end{aligned}$$

Since $\beta_{k+1} > 0, \alpha_{k+1} > 0$ and $\beta_{k+1} + \alpha_{k+1} = 1$, we have by convexity

$$g(\alpha_1 x_1 + ... + \alpha_k x_k + \alpha_{k+1} x_{k+1}) \leq \beta_{k+1} g(y_{k+1}) + \alpha_{k+1} g(x_{k+1}).$$

But, we also have

$$\alpha_1^* + ... + \alpha_k^* = 1, \ \alpha_i^* > 0, 1 \leq i \leq k.$$

Then by the induction hypothesis, we have

$$g(y_{k+1}) = g(\alpha_1^* x_1 + ... + \alpha_k^* x_k) \leq \alpha_1^* g(x_1) + ... + \alpha_k^* g(x_k).$$

By combining these facts, we get

$$\begin{aligned} g(\alpha_1 x_1 + ... + \alpha_k x_k + \alpha_{k+1} x_{k+1}) &\leq \alpha_1^* \beta_{k+1} g(x_1) + ... + \alpha_k^* \beta_{k+1} g(x_k) + \alpha_{k+1} g(x_{k+1}) \\ &= \alpha_1 g(x_1) + ... + \alpha_k g(x_k) + \alpha_{k+1} g(x_{k+1}), \end{aligned}$$

since $\alpha_i^* \beta_{k+1} = \alpha_i, 1 \leq i \leq k$. Thus, we have proved

$$g(\alpha_1 x_1 + ... + \alpha_k x_k + \alpha_{k+1} x_{k+1}) \leq \alpha_1 g(x_1) + ... + \alpha_k g(x_k) + \alpha_{k+1} g(x_{k+1}).$$

We conclude that Formula (2.2) holds for any $k \geq 2$.

D2 - A convexity formula with a infinite and countable abitrary finite number of points.

Let g be bounded on I or I be a closed bounded interval. Then for an infinite and countable number of coefficients $(\alpha_i)_{i \geq 0}$ with

$$\sum_{i \geq 0} \alpha_i = 1, \quad \text{and } \forall (i \geq 0), \ \alpha_i > 0$$

and for any family of $(x_i)_{i \geq 0}$ of points in I, we have

$$g\left(\sum_{i \geq 0} \alpha_i x_i \right) \leq \sum_{i \geq 0} \alpha_i g(x_i). \tag{2.3}$$

Proof. Assume we have the hypotheses and the notations of the assertion to be proved. Either g is bounded or I in a bounded interval. In Part A of this section, we saw that a convex function is continuous. If I is a bounded closed interval, we get that g is bounded on I. So, by the hypotheses of the assertion, g is bounded. Let M be a bound of $|g|$.

Now, fix $k \geq 1$ and denote

$$\gamma_k = \sum_{i=0}^{k} \alpha_i \text{ and } \alpha_i^* = \alpha_i / \gamma_k \text{ for } i = 0, ..., k$$

and

$$\beta_k = \sum_{i=0}^{k} \alpha_i \text{ and } \alpha_i^{**} = \alpha_i / \beta_k \text{ for } i \geq k+1.$$

We have

$$\begin{aligned} g\left(\sum_{i\geq 0}\alpha_i x_i\right) &= g\left(\sum_{i=0}^{k}\alpha_i x_i + \sum_{i\geq k+1}\alpha_i x_i\right) \\ &= g\left(\gamma_k \sum_{i=0}^{k}\alpha_i^* x_i + \beta_k \sum_{i\geq k+1}\alpha_i^{**} x_i\right) \\ &\leq \gamma_k g\left(\sum_{i=0}^{k}\alpha_i^* x_i\right) + \beta_k g\left(\sum_{i\geq k+1}\alpha_i^{**} x_i\right), \end{aligned}$$

by convexity. By using Formula (2.2), and by using the fact that $\gamma_k \alpha_i^* = \alpha_i$ for $i = 1, ..., k$, we arrive at

$$g\left(\sum_{i\geq 0}\alpha_i x_i\right) \leq \sum_{i=0}^{k}\alpha_i g(x_i) + \beta_k g\left(\sum_{i\geq k+1}\alpha_i^{**} x_i\right). \tag{2.4}$$

Now, we use the bound M of g to have

$$\left|\beta_k g\left(\sum_{i\geq k+1}\alpha_i^{**} x_i\right)\right| \leq M\beta_k \to 0 \text{ as } k \to \infty.$$

Then, by letting $k \to \infty$ in (2.4), we get

$$g\left(\sum_{i\geq 0}\alpha_i x_i\right) \leq \sum_{i=0}^{k}\alpha_i g(x_i). \tag{2.5}$$

■

3. Monotone Convergence and Dominated Converges of series

Later, measure theory allows to have powerful convergence theorems. But many people use probability theory and/or statistical mathematics without taking a course such a course.

To these readers, we may show how to stay at the level of elementary calculus and to have workable versions of powerful tools when dealing with discrete probability measures.

We will have two results of calculus that will help in that sense. In this section, we deal with real numbers series of the form

$$\sum_{n\in\mathbb{Z}} a_n.$$

The sequence $(a_n)_{n\in\mathbb{Z}}$ may be considered as a function $f : \mathbb{Z} \mapsto \overline{\mathbb{R}}$ such that, any $n \in \mathbb{Z}$, we have for $f(n) = a_n$, and the series becomes

$$\sum_{n\in\mathbb{Z}} f(n).$$

We may speak of a sequence $(a_n)_{n\in\mathbb{Z}}$ or simply of a function f on $\mathbb{Z}$.

A - Monotone Convergence Theorem of series.

THEOREM 6. *Let $f : \mathbb{Z} \mapsto \overline{\mathbb{R}}_+$ be nonnegative function and let $f_p : \mathbb{Z} \mapsto \overline{\mathbb{R}}_+$, $p \geq 1$, be a sequence of nonnegative functions increasing to f in the following sense :*

$$\forall (n \in \mathbb{Z}), \quad 0 \leq f_p(n) \uparrow f(n) \text{ as } p \uparrow \infty \tag{3.1}$$

Then, we have

$$\sum_{n\in\mathbb{Z}} f_p(n) \uparrow \sum_{n\in\mathbb{Z}} f(n)$$

Proof. Let us study two cases.

Case 1. There exists $n_0 \in \mathbb{Z}$ such that $f(n_0) = +\infty$. Then

$$\sum_{n\in\mathbb{Z}} f(n) = +\infty$$

Since $f_p(n_0) \uparrow f(n_0) = +\infty$, then for any $M > 0$, there exits $P_0 \geq 1$, such that

$$p > P_0 \Rightarrow f_p(n_0) > M$$

Thus, we have

$$\forall (M > 0), \exists (P_0 \geq 1),\ p > P_0 \Rightarrow \sum_{n\in\mathbb{Z}} f_p(n) > M.$$

By letting $p \to \infty$ in the latter formula, we have : for all $M > 0$,

$$\sum_{n\in\mathbb{Z}} f_p(n) \geq M.$$

By letting $\to +\infty$, we get

$$\sum_{n\in\mathbb{Z}} f_p(n) \uparrow +\infty = \sum_{n\in\mathbb{Z}} f(n)$$

The proof is complete in the case 1.

Case 2. Suppose that que $f(n) < \infty$ for any $n \in \mathbb{Z}$. By 3.1, it is clear that

$$\sum_{n\in\mathbb{Z}} f_p(n) \leq \sum_{n\in\mathbb{Z}} f(n).$$

The left-hand member is nondecreasing in p. So its limit is a monotone limit and it always exists in $\overline{\mathbb{R}}$ and we have

$$\lim_{p\to+\infty} \sum_{n\in\mathbb{Z}} f_p(n) \leq \sum_{n\in\mathbb{Z}} f(n).$$

Now, fix an integer $N > 1$. For any $\varepsilon > 0$, there exists P_N such that

$$p > P_N \Rightarrow (\forall(-N \leq n \leq N),\ f(n)-\varepsilon/(2N+1) \leq f_p(n) \leq f(n)+\varepsilon/(2N+1)$$

and thus,

$$p > P_N \Rightarrow \sum_{-N\leq n\leq N} f_p(n) \geq \sum_{-N\leq n\leq N} f(n) - \varepsilon.$$

Thus, we have

$$p > P_N \Rightarrow \sum_{n\in} f_p(n) \geq \sum_{-N\leq n\leq N} f_p(n) \geq \sum_{-N\leq n\leq N} f(n) - \varepsilon,$$

meaning that for $p > P_N$,

$$\sum_{-N\leq n\leq N} f(n) - \varepsilon \leq \sum_{-N\leq n\leq N} f_p(n).$$

and then, for $p > P_N$,

$$\sum_{-N\leq n\leq N} f(n) - \varepsilon \leq \sum_{n\in\mathbb{Z}} f_p(n).$$

By letting $p \uparrow \infty$ first and next, $N \uparrow \infty$, we get for any $\varepsilon > 0$,

$$\sum_{n\in\mathbb{Z}} f(n) - \varepsilon \leq \lim_{p\to+\infty} \sum_{n\in\mathbb{Z}} f_p(n).$$

Finally, by letting $\varepsilon \downarrow 0$, we get

$$\sum_{n\in\mathbb{Z}} f(n) \leq \lim_{n} \sum_{n\in\mathbb{Z}} f_p(n)$$

We conclude that

$$\sum_{n\in\mathbb{Z}} f(n) = lim_{p\uparrow+\infty} \sum_{n\in\mathbb{Z}} f_p(n)$$

The case 2 is now closed and the proof of the theorem is complete.

B - Fatou-Lebesgues Theorem or Dominated Convergence Theorem for series.

THEOREM 7. *Let $f_p : \mathbb{Z} \mapsto \overline{\mathbb{R}}$, $p \geq 1$, be a sequence of functions.*

(1) Suppose there exists a function $g : \mathbb{Z} \mapsto \mathbb{R}$ such that :

(a) $\sum_{n\in\mathbb{Z}} |g(n)| < +\infty$,

and

(b) For any $n \in \mathbb{Z}$, $g(n) \leq f_p(n)$.

Then we have

$$\sum_{n\in\mathbb{Z}} \liminf_{p\to+\infty} f_p(n) \leq \liminf_{p\to+\infty} \sum_{n\in\mathbb{Z}} f_p(n). \tag{3.2}$$

(2) Suppose there exists a function $g : \mathbb{Z} \mapsto \mathbb{R}$ such that :

(a) $\sum_{n\in\mathbb{Z}} |g(n)| < +\infty$,

and

(b) For any $n \in \mathbb{Z}$, $f_p n \leq g(n)$.

Then we have

$$\limsup_{p\to+\infty} \sum_{n\in\mathbb{Z}} f_p(n) \leq \sum_{n\in\mathbb{Z}} \limsup_{p\to+\infty} f_p(n). \tag{3.3}$$

(3) suppose that there exists a function $f : \mathbb{Z} \mapsto \overline{\mathbb{R}}$ such that the sequence of functions $(f_p)_p \geq 1$ pointwisely converges to f, that is :

$$\forall (n \in \mathbb{Z}), \quad f_p(n) \to f(n) \text{ as } n \to \infty. \tag{3.4}$$

And suppose that there exists a function $g : \mathbb{Z} \mapsto \mathbb{R}$ *such that :*
(a) $\sum_{n\in\mathbb{Z}} |g(n)| < +\infty$,

and

(b) For any $n \in \mathbb{Z}$, $|f_p(n)| \leq |g(n)|$.

Then we have

$$\lim_{p\to+\infty} \sum_{n\in\mathbb{Z}} f_p(n) = \sum_{n\in\mathbb{Z}} f(n) \in \mathbb{R}. \tag{3.5}$$

Proof.

Part (1). Under the hypotheses of this part, we have that $g(n)$ is finite for any $n \in \mathbb{Z}$ and then $(f_p - g)_{p\geq 1}$ is a sequence nonnegative function defined on $\mathbb{Z}$ with values in $\overline{\mathbb{R}}_+$. The sequence of functions

$$h_p = \inf_{k\geq n} (f_k - g)$$

defined by

$$h_p(n) = \inf_{k\geq n} (f_k(n) - g(n)), \ n \in \mathbb{Z}$$

is a sequence nonnegative functions defined on $\mathbb{Z}$ with values in $\overline{\mathbb{R}}_+$.

By reminding the definition of the inferior limit (See the first section of that Appendix Chapter), we see that for any $n \in \mathbb{Z}$,

$$h_p(n) \uparrow \liminf_{p\to+\infty} (f_p(n) - g(n)).$$

Recall that, for any fixed $n \in \mathbb{Z}$,

$$\liminf_{p\to+\infty} (g(n) - f_p(n)) = (\liminf_p \to +\infty) f_p(n) \ - g(n).$$

On one side, we may apply the Monotone Convergence Theorem to get, as $p \uparrow +\infty$,

$$\sum_{n\in\mathbb{Z}} h_p(n) \uparrow \sum_{n\in\mathbb{Z}} \liminf_{p\to+\infty} f_p(n) - \sum_{n\in\mathbb{Z}} g(n). \tag{3.6}$$

We also have, for any $n \in \mathbb{Z}$, for any $k \geq p$,

$$h_p(n) \leq (f_k(n) - g(n))$$

and for any $k \geq p$

$$\sum_{n\in\mathbb{Z}} h_p(n) \leq \sum_{n\in\mathbb{Z}} (f_k(n) - g(n))$$

$$\sum_{n\in\mathbb{Z}} h_p(n) \leq \inf_{k\geq p} \sum_{n\in\mathbb{Z}} (f_k(n) - g(n)). \tag{3.7}$$

Remark that

$$\inf_{k\geq p} \sum_{n\in\mathbb{Z}} (f_k(n) - g(n)) = \left\{ \inf_{k\geq p} \sum_{n\in\mathbb{Z}} f_k(n) \right\} - \sum_{n\in\mathbb{Z}} g(n)$$

to get

$$\sum_{n\in\mathbb{Z}} h_p(n) \leq \left\{ \inf_{k\geq p} \sum_{n\in\mathbb{Z}} f_k(n) \right\} - \sum_{n\in\mathbb{Z}} g(n). \tag{3.8}$$

By letting $p \to +\infty$, by using (3.6) and by reminding the definition of the inferior limit, we get

(3.9)

$$\sum_{n\in\mathbb{Z}} \liminf_{p\to+\infty} f_p(n) - \sum_{n\in\mathbb{Z}} g(n) \leq \left(\liminf_{\limsup_{p\to+\infty}} \sum_{n\in\mathbb{Z}} f_k(n)\} \right) - \left(\sum_{n\in\mathbb{Z}} g(n) \right).$$

Since $\sum_{n\in\mathbb{Z}} g(n)$ is finite, we may add it to both members to have

$$\liminf p \to +\infty f_p(n) \leq \liminf_{p\to} \sum_{n\in\mathbb{Z}} f_p(n) \tag{3.10}$$

.

Part (2). By taking the opposite functions $-f_p$, we find ourselves in the Part 1. In applying this part, the inferior limits are converted into superior limits when the minus sign is taken out of the limits, and next eliminated.

Part (3). In this case, the conditions of the two first parts hold. We have the two conclusions we may combine in

$$\begin{aligned} & \sum_{n\in\mathbb{Z}} \liminf_{p\to+\infty} f_p(n) \\ \leq & \liminf_{p\to+\infty} \sum_{n\in\mathbb{Z}} f_p(n) \\ \leq & \limsup_{p\to+\infty} \sum_{n\in\mathbb{Z}} f_p(n) \\ \leq & \sum_{n\in\mathbb{Z}} \limsup_{p\to+\infty} f_p(n) \end{aligned}$$

Since the limit of the sequence of functions f_p is f, that is for any $n \in \mathbb{Z}$,

$$\liminf_{p\to+\infty} f_p(n) = \limsup_{p\to+\infty} f_p(n) = f(n),$$

and since

$$\left|\sum_{n\in\mathbb{Z}} f_p(n)\right| \leq \mathbb{Z}|f_p(n)| < +\infty,$$

we get

$$\lim_{p\to+\infty} \sum_{n\in\mathbb{Z}} f_p(n) = \sum_{n\in\mathbb{Z}} f(n)$$

and

$$\left|\sum_{n\in\mathbb{Z}} f(n)\right| < +\infty.$$

4. Proof of Stirling's Formula

We are going to provide a proof of this formula. One can find several proofs (See Feller [**6**], page 52, for example). Here, we give the proof in Valiron [**14**], pp. 167, that is based on Wallis integrals. We think that a student in first year of University will be interested by an application of the course of his Riemann integration.

A - Wallis Formula.

We have the Wallis Formula

$$\pi = \lim_{n\to+\infty} \left\{ \frac{2^{4n} \times (n!)^4}{n\left\{(2n)!\right\}^2} \right\}. \tag{4.1}$$

Proof. Define for $n \geq 1$,

$$I_n = \int_0^{\pi/2} \sin^n x dx. \tag{4.2}$$

On one hand, let us remark that for $0 < x < \pi/2$, we have by the elementary properties of the sine function that

$$0 < \sin x < 1 < (1/\sin x).$$

Then by multiplying all members of this double inequality by $\sin^{2n} x$ for $0 < x < \pi/2$ and for $n \geq 1$, we have

$$\sin^{2n+1} x < \sin^{2n} x < \sin^{2n-1} x.$$

By integrating the functions in the inequality over $[0, \pi/2]$, and by using (4.2), we obtain for $n \geq 1$.

$$I_{2n+1} < I_{2n} < I_{2n-1}. \tag{4.3}$$

On another hand, we may integrate by part and get for $n \geq 2$,

$$\begin{aligned}
I_n &= \int_0^{\pi/2} \sin^2 x \sin^{n-2} x dx \\
&= \int_0^{\pi/2} (1-\cos^2 x) \sin^{n-2} x \ dx \\
&= I_{n-2} - \int_0^{\pi/2} \cos x \ (\cos x \sin^{n-2} x) \ dx \\
&= I_{n-2} - \frac{1}{n-1} \int_0^{\pi/2} \cos x \ d(\sin^{n-1} x) \\
&= I_{n-2} - \left[\frac{\cos x \ \sin^{n-1} x}{n-1} \right]_0^{\pi/2} - \frac{1}{n-1} \int_0^{\pi/2} \sin^n x \ dx \\
&= I_{n-2} - \frac{1}{n-1} \int_0^{\pi/2} \sin^n x \ dx \\
&= I_{n-2} - \frac{1}{n-1} I_n.
\end{aligned}$$

Then for $n \geq 2$,

$$I_n = \frac{n-1}{n} I_{n-2}.$$

We apply this to an even number $2n$, $n \geq 1$, to get by induction

$$\begin{aligned}
I_{2n} &= \frac{2n-1}{2n} I_{2n-2} = \frac{2n-1}{2n} \times \frac{2n-3}{2n-2} I_{2n-4} \\
&= \frac{2n-1}{2n} \frac{2n-3}{2n-2} \times ... \times \frac{2n-2p+1}{2n-2p+2} I_{2n-2p}.
\end{aligned}$$

For $p = n \geq 1$, we get

$$I_{2n} = I_0 \frac{1 \times 3 \times 5 \times ... \times (2n-1)}{2 \times 4 \times ... \times 2n}.$$

For an odd number $2n+1$, $n \geq 1$, we have

$$\begin{aligned}
I_{2n+1} &= \frac{2n}{2n+1} I_{2n-1} = \frac{2n}{2n+1} \times \frac{2n-2}{2n-1} I_{2n-3} \\
&= \frac{2n}{2n+1} \times \frac{2n-2}{2n-1} I_{2n-3} \times ... \times \frac{2n-2p}{2n-2p+1} I_{2n-2p+1}.
\end{aligned}$$

For $p = n - 1 \geq 0$, we have

$$I_{2n+1} = I_1 \frac{2 \times 4 \times ... \times 2n}{3 \times 5 \times ... \times (2n+1)}.$$

We easily check that

$$I_0 = \pi/2 \text{ and } I_1 = 1.$$

Thus the inequality $I_{2n+1} < I_{2n}$ of (4.3), for $n \geq 1$, yields

$$\frac{\{2 \times 4 \times ... \times 2n\}^2}{\{3 \times 5 \times ... \times (2n-1)\}^2 (2n+1)} < \frac{\pi}{2}$$

and $I_{2n} < I_{2n-1}$ in (4.3), for $n \geq 1$, leads to

$$\frac{\pi}{2} < \frac{\{2 \times 4 \times ... \times 2n\}^2}{\{3 \times 5 \times ... \times (2n-1)\}^2 (2n)}.$$

We get the double inequality

$$\frac{\{2 \times 4 \times ... \times 2n\}^2}{\{3 \times 5 \times ... \times (2n-1)\}^2 (2n+1)} < \frac{\pi}{2} < \frac{\{2 \times 4 \times ... \times 2n\}^2}{\{3 \times 5 \times ... \times (2n-1)\}^2 (2n)},$$

which leads to,

$$1 - \frac{1}{2n} < \{\pi/2\} \left\{ \frac{\{2 \times 4 \times ... \times 2n\}^2}{\{3 \times 5 \times ... \times (2n-1)\}^2 (2n)} \right\}^{-1} - 1 \leq 1, \ n \geq 1.$$

In particular, this implies that

$$\pi/2 = \lim_{n \to +\infty} \left\{ \frac{\{2 \times 4 \times ... \times 2n\}^2}{\{3 \times 5 \times ... \times (2n-1)\}^2 (2n)} \right\}. \tag{4.4}$$

But, we have to transform

$$A_n = \frac{\{2 \times 4 \times ... \times 2n\}^2}{\{3 \times 5 \times ... \times (2n-1)\}^2 (2n+1)}.$$

Let us transform the numerator to get

$$\begin{aligned} A_n &= \frac{\{2 \times 4 \times ... \times 2n\}^2}{\{3 \times 5 \times ... \times (2n-1)\}^2 (2n+1)} \\ &= \frac{\{(2 \times 1) \times (2 \times 2) \times ... \times (2 \times n)\}^2}{\{3 \times 5 \times ... \times (2n-1)\}^2 (2n)} \\ &= \frac{\{2^n \times n!\}^2}{\{3 \times 5 \times ... \times (2n-1)\}^2 (2n)}. \end{aligned}$$

Next, we transform the denominator to get

$$\begin{aligned} A_n &= \{2^n \times n!\}^2 \frac{\{2 \times 4 \times ... \times 2(n-1)\}^2}{\{(2n-1)!\}^2 (2n)} \\ &= \{2^n \times n!\}^2 \frac{\{2 \times 4 \times ... \times 2(n-1)\}^2 (2n)^2}{\{(2n-1)!\}^2 (2n)^2} \times \frac{1}{2n} \\ &= \{2^n \times n!\}^2 \frac{\{2 \times 4 \times ... \times 2(n-1)(2n)\}^2}{\{(2n)!\}^2} \times \frac{1}{2n} \\ &= \frac{1}{2} \times \frac{2^{4n} \times (n!)^4}{n \{(2n)!\}^2}. \end{aligned}$$

Combining this with (4.4) leads to the Wallis formula (4.1).

The Wallis formula is now proved. Now, let us move to the Stirling Formula.

Stirling's Formula.

We have for $n \geq 1$

$$\log(n!) = \sum_{p=1}^{p=n} \log p$$

and

$$\begin{aligned} \int_0^n \log x \; dx &= \int_0^n d(x \log x - x) = [x \log x - x]_0^n \\ &= n \log n - n = n \log(n/e). \end{aligned}$$

Let consider the sequence

$$s_n = \log(n!) - n(\log n - 1).$$

By using an expansion of the logarithm function in the neighborhood of 1 wa have for $n > 1$,

$$\begin{aligned} u_n &= s_n - s_{n-1} = 1 + (n-1)\log\frac{n-1}{n} \\ &= 1 + (n-1)\log(1-\frac{1}{n}) \\ &= 1 + (n-1)\left(-\frac{1}{n} - \frac{1}{2n^2} - \frac{(1+\varepsilon_n(1))}{3n^3}\right) \qquad (4.5) \\ &= \frac{1}{2n} + \frac{1}{6n^2} - \frac{\varepsilon_n(1)}{3n^2} + \frac{(1+\varepsilon_n(1))}{3n^3}. \end{aligned}$$

where

$$\begin{aligned} 0 \leq \varepsilon_n(1) &= 3\sum_{p=4}\frac{1}{pn^{p-3}} \\ &\leq \leq \frac{3}{4n}\sum_{p=4}\frac{4}{pn^{p-4}} \\ &\leq \leq \frac{3}{4n}\sum_{p=4}\frac{1}{n^{p-4}} \\ &= \frac{3}{4n} \to 0 \text{ as } n \to +\infty. \end{aligned}$$

Set

$$\begin{aligned} S_n &= s_n - \frac{1}{2}\log n \\ &= \log(-n!) - n\log(n/e) - \frac{1}{2}\log n. \qquad (4.6) \end{aligned}$$

We have

$$\begin{aligned} v_n &= S_n - S_{n-1} \\ &= s_n - s_{n-1} + \frac{1}{2}\log\frac{n-1}{n}. \end{aligned}$$

By using again the same expansion for

$$\log\frac{n-1}{n} = -\log\frac{n}{n-1},$$

and by combining with (4.5), we get

$$v_n = -\frac{1}{12n^2} - \frac{\varepsilon_n(1)}{3n^2} + \frac{(1+\varepsilon_n(1))}{6n^3}.$$

We see that the series $S = \sum_n v_n$ is finite and we have

$$R_n = S - S_n = \sum_{p=n+1}^{\infty} \left\{ -\frac{1}{12p^2} - \frac{\varepsilon_p(1)}{3p^2} + \frac{(1+\varepsilon_p(1))}{6p^3}) \right\}. \tag{4.7}$$

Is is clear that R_n may be bounded by the sum of three remainders of convergent series, for n, large enough. So R_n goes to zero as $n \to +\infty$. We will come back to a finer analysis to R_n.

From (4.6), we have for $n \geq 1$,

$$\begin{aligned} n! &= n^{1/2}(n/e)^n \exp(-(S - S_n)) \\ &= n^{1/2}(n/e)^n e^S \exp(-R_n). \end{aligned}$$

Let us use the Wallis Formula

$$\begin{aligned} \pi &= \lim_{n\to+\infty} \frac{2^{4n} \times (n!)^4}{n\left\{(2n)!\right\}^2} \\ &= \lim_{n\to+\infty} \frac{2^{4n} \times n^2(n/e)^{4n} e^S \exp(-4R_n)}{n\left\{(2n)^{1/2}(2n/e)^{2n} e^{4S} \exp(-R_{2n})\right\}^2} \\ &= \lim_{n\to+\infty} \frac{2^{4n} \times n^2(n/e)^{4n} e^{4S} \exp(-4R_n)}{n(2n)(2n/e)^{4n} e^{2S} \exp(-2R_{2n})} \\ &= \lim_{n\to+\infty} \frac{1}{2} \frac{2^{4n} \times n^2(n/e)^{4n} e^{4S}}{2^{4n} n^2 (n/e)^{4n} e^{2S}} \exp(-4R_n - 2R_n) \\ &= \frac{1}{2} e^{2S}, \end{aligned}$$

since $\exp(-4R_n - 2R_n) \to 0$ as $n \to +\infty$.

Thus, we arrive at

$$e^S = \sqrt{2\pi}.$$

We get the formula

$$n! = \sqrt{n2\pi}(n/e)^n \exp(-R_n).$$

Now let us make a finer analysis to R_n. Let us make use of the classical comparison between series of monotone sequences and integrals.

Let $b \geq 1$. By comparing the area under the curve of $f(x) = x^{-b}$ going from j to k and that of the rectangles based on the intervals $[h, h+1]$, $h = 1, .., k-1$, we obtain

$$\sum_{h=j+1}^{k} h^{-b} \leq \int_{j}^{k-1} x^{-b} dx \leq \sum_{h=j}^{k-1} h^{-b},$$

This implies that

$$\int_{j}^{k} x^{-b} dx + (k)^{-b} \leq \sum_{h=j}^{k} h^{-b} \leq \int_{j}^{k} x^{-b} dx + j^{-b}. \tag{4.8}$$

Applying this and letting k go to ∞ gives

$$\frac{1}{(n+1)} \leq \sum_{p \geq n+1}^{k} p^{-2} \leq \frac{1}{n+1} + \frac{1}{(n+1)}$$

and

$$\frac{1}{2(n+1)^2} \leq \sum_{p \geq n+1}^{k} p^{-3} \leq \frac{1}{2(n+1)^2} + \frac{1}{(n+1)^3}.$$

Let $r > 0$ be an arbitrary real number. For n large enough, we will have $0 \geq \varepsilon_p(1) \leq r$ for $p \geq (n+1)$. Then by combining the previous inequalities, we have for n large enough,

$$\begin{aligned} -R_n &\geq \frac{1}{12(n+1)} - \frac{(1+r)}{12(n+1)^2} - \frac{(1+r)}{6(n+1)^3} \\ &\geq \frac{1}{(n+1)} \left(\frac{1}{12} - \frac{(1+r)}{12(n+1)} - \frac{(1+r)}{6(n+1)^2} \right). \end{aligned}$$

Then $-R_n \geq$ for n large enough. Next

$$\begin{aligned} -R_n &\leq \frac{1}{12(n+1)} + \frac{1}{12(n+1)^2} + \frac{r}{3(n+1)} + \frac{r}{3(n+1)^2} - \frac{(1+r)}{12(n+1)^3} \\ &= \frac{1}{(n+1)} \left(\frac{1+4r}{12} + \frac{1}{12(n+1)} + \frac{r}{3(n+1)} - \frac{(1+r)}{12(n+1)^3} \right) \end{aligned}$$

And clearly, for n large enough, we have

$$-R_n \leq \frac{1+5r}{12(n+1)}.$$

Since $r > 0$ is arbitrary, we have for any $\eta >$, for n large enough,

$$|R_n| \leq \frac{1+\eta}{12n}.$$

This finishes the proof of the Stirling Formula.

Bibliography

[1] Gutt, A.(2005). *Probability : A Graduate Course*. Springer-Verlag.
[2] Lo, G.S.(2016). Introduction to Measure and Integration. University Gaston Berger.
[3] Lo, G.S.(2016). Measure and integration by tutorials. University Gaston Berger.
[4] Lo, G.S.(2016). *Mathematical foundation of Probability Theory*. To be posted in Arxiv soon.
[5] Loève, Michel.(1997). *Probability Theory I*. Springer-Verlag, 4th Edition.
[6] Feller W.(1968) *An introduction to Probability Theory and its Applications. Volume 1*. Third Editions. John Wiley & Sons Inc., New-York.
[7] Billingsley, P.(1995). *Probability and Measure*. Third Editions. John Wiley & Sons Inc., New-York.
[8] Breiman, L.(1968). *Probability*. Addison-Wesley Publishing Co., Reading, Mass.,
[9] Chung K.L.(2001) *A course of Probability Theory*. THird Edition. Academic Press. Boston.
[10] Foata Dominique, Aimé Fuchs, *Calcul de probabilités*, Dunod, Paris 2nd Ed, 1998
[11] Métivier, M., *Notions Pondamentales de Probabilités*, Dunod Université, 1979
[12] K. R. Parthasarathy). *Introduction to Probabality and Measure*. Hindustan Book Agency. India, 2005.
[13] Jordan Stoyanov, *Counterexamples in Probability*, Wiley, 1987.
[14] Valiron, G.(1946). *Cours d'Analyse*. Mason, Paris. Edition.